

NO STONE ON ANOTHER

SUPPLEMENTS TO OVUM TESTAMENTUM

EDITORIAL BOARD

President: W. C. VAN UNNIK, Bilthoven (Utr.) Netherlands

P. BRATSIOTIS

K. W. CLARK

H. CLAVIER

J. W. DOEVE

J. DORESSE

C. W. DUGMORE

DOM J. DUPONT O. S. B.

E. STAUFFER

A. GEYSER

W. GROSSOUW

A. F. J. KLIJN

PH. H. MENOUD

BO REICKE

K. H. RENGSTORF

P. SCHUBERT

VOLUME XXIII



LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL

1970

NO STONE ON ANOTHER

STUDIES
IN THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE FALL OF JERUSALEM
IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

BY

LLOYD GASTON



LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1970

Copyright 1970 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

τῇ ὑπομονῇ τε καὶ τῇ ἀγάπῃ
τῆς γυναικὸς μου Σουσάννας

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface.	ix
I. Introduction	i
1. The Problem	i
2. Questions	6
II. Analysis of Mark 13	8
1. Analysis	10
2. Form and Function of Mark 13	41
3. The Genesis of Mark 13	61
III. Jesus and the Temple	65
1. The Temple Cult in the Gospels	75
2. The Destruction of the Temple	102
A. The Expectation of the New Temple	105
B. The Cleansing of the Temple	112
C. Opposition to the Temple in Qumran	119
D. Lustrations and Sacrifice	128
E. Jewish-Christian Opposition to the Temple.	140
F. The Messiah and the Temple	147
G. Stephen and the Temple	154
3. The New Temple.	161
A. The Community as the Temple in Qumran	163
B. The Ambiguity of the Image of the Temple in the N.T. Epistles	176
C. Jesus as the Temple in the Fourth Gospel.	205
D. The Stone and the Foundation	213
E. The Community as the Temple in the Teaching of Jesus	229
4. Conclusion	242
IV. The Fall of Jerusalem as a Political Event in Luke-Acts	244
1. The Theory of Proto-Luke	244
2. The Birth Stories.	256
3. Jesus, Prophet and Messiah	276
4. Jesus and Israel	298
5. The Promise of Peace and the Threat of War.	334
6. Appendix: Jerusalem and the Temple in the Lucan Writings	365

V. The Fall of Jerusalem and Eschatology	370
1. Jesus and the Future	370
A. The Son of Man.	370
B. The Kingdom of God as Promise and Crisis . .	409
C. Israel and the Gentiles	428
2. Prophets of the Early Church and Predictions of the End	433
3. Mark and the Fall of Jerusalem	468
Bibliography	488
Index Auctorum	511
Index Locorum	517

PREFACE

It is often difficult to convey to the reader the excitement which the author experiences in seeing new perspectives arise out of his research on the much-studied New Testament. That one also cannot convey the many disappointments involved when promising paths turn into dead ends is perhaps better for all concerned. The present study arose out of a series of connected questions, some of which could not be answered to the satisfaction of the author, but some of which led him to answers which surprised him greatly. Because of the surprise, hence the excitement. It is hoped that in the welter of detail and wide-ranging discussions the reader may sense some of the excitement too. New Testament scholarship is sometimes tedious, it is sometimes relevant to the church, but in addition it is also fun.

The present work was begun in Switzerland in 1957. It was completed in Minnesota in 1967. It is of course impossible to acknowledge all the teachers and family and friends who have encouraged and stimulated and supported me during these ten years. Apart from the dedication, it is possible to express my gratitude only to Professors Oscar Cullmann and Bo Reicke, who guided my study from 1954 to 1960 and who in 1967 accepted the work as a dissertation for the Theological Faculty of the University of Basle; to Professor Gerhard von Rad for a stimulating year at Princeton in 1960-61; to the editors of E. J. Brill, who accepted the work for publication; and to Macalester College, for a grant which helped make publication possible. To them and to all the others who cannot be named here, I am profoundly grateful.

Extended passages are given in my own translation, unless otherwise indicated. The abbreviations are the usual ones.

Macalester College
St. Paul, Minnesota

LLOYD GASTON

2 June 1969

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

I. THE PROBLEM

After nineteen centuries of mutual polemic and an almost unbelievable history of persecutions, the church and the synagogue are in our time once more beginning to speak to one another as separated brethren of the one people of God.¹ One very crucial historical event concerning which a common understanding has not yet been reached was the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple in A.D. 70. Indeed, the bitter separation of the church and the synagogue can be traced back to the different attitudes taken toward this great catastrophe. The formative period of the Church had occurred just previous to this time in the decision for Gentile mission,² and the formative period of the synagogue just afterward in reaction to it.³ The fall of Jerusalem is then not an event common to the history of both church and synagogue, and while for the one it represented a call to renewed obedience to the Torah, for the

¹ For the beginnings of a history of this dialogue, cf. H. J. Schoeps, *Israel und Christenheit; Jüdisch-christliches Religionsgespräch in neunzehn Jahrhunderten*, München and Frankfurt a/M., 1960.

² "Weit verbreitet ist die Ansicht, dass die Zerstörung Jerusalems im Jahre 70 von entscheidender Bedeutung für die Entwicklung des Christentums gewesen sei; erst durch sie habe sich dieses definitiv vom Judentum emanzipiert und sei der Sieg des Heidenchristentums entschieden worden. Aber den Tatsachen entspricht diese Auffassung nicht; der Bruch und die Lösung von Jerusalem ist vielmehr bereits von Paulus vollzogen. Die weiteren dortigen Vorgänge haben natürlich das Interesse der Christen erregt, die Zerstörung von Stadt und Tempel erschien ihnen als Erfüllung der Weissagungen und als das verdiente Strafgericht über das halsstarige Volk, als Bestätigung dafür, dass die Juden in der Tat Offenbarung und Schrift vollkommen missverstanden hätten, dass allein die Christen das wahre Israel, das auserwählte Volk und die Träger der göttlichen Verheissung seien; aber eine weitere Bedeutung für ihre Auffassung des Christentums kam dem nicht mehr zu, die war vielmehr längst von Paulus festgelegt," E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, Stuttgart-Berlin, 1921-23, Bd. III, p. 584.

³ Cf. G. F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*, Vol. I-III, Cambridge, Mass., 1927-1930; A. Ehrhardt, "The Birth of the Synagogue and R. Akiba," *Stud. Theol.* 9 (1955), 86-111; J. Neusner, *A Life of Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai*, Leiden, 1962; W. D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*, Cambridge, 1964.

other it became a sign of the rejection of the old Israel. Our present study will concentrate on the background of the Christian attitude to the fall of Jerusalem as this was expressed by Jesus and the first generation of the church before the event.

We can begin with the conclusions of the only two studies that have been devoted to this theme. H. Windisch¹ concludes: "Für die gläubigen Juden war die Vernichtung ihrer Stadt und ihres Heiligtums ein furchtbarer Schlag. Ein wichtiger Bestandteil ihrer Observanz, der Kultus, war damit unmöglich gemacht, ihre Hoffnungen, ihre Ansprüche, ihre Glaubensüberzeugungen waren vernichtet. . . . Den Christen bedeutete der Untergang der heiligen Stadt und ihres Tempels in erster Linie eine Bestätigung der Weissagung ihres Herrn und ein Strafgericht für die Kreuzigung ihres Herrn. Namentlich den Judenchristen wird er Schmerz bereitet haben, eine Gefährdung ihres Glaubens war er nicht." With respect to the generation before the fall, Windisch' conclusion is very questionable, but it is all too true for the later history of the church.

This is the conclusion reached by H. J. Schoeps:² "Dass der Untergang Jerusalems, die Zerstörung des Heiligtums, und die Zerstreuung unter die Völker als Strafgerichte Gottes über die Juden für die Kreuzigung Jesu anzusprechen seien, dieser ursachliche Zusammenhang ist wohl frühpatristisches Glaubensgut. . . . In dieser populären Form: Der Tempel der Juden wurde zerstört und die Juden mussten ins Exil, weil sie den Sohn Gottes getötet haben, reicht diese Überzeugung des christlichen Glaubens bis in unsere Tage." Our present study will attempt to investigate the question whether this widespread attitude has any basis in the first generation of the church, insofar as this is reflected in the synoptic gospels.

¹ "Der Untergang Jerusalem (Anno 70) im Urtheil der Christen und Juden," *Theol. Tijdschrift* 48 (1914), 519-550, pp. 548f. A useful collection of some patristic material but otherwise not very helpful is E. Fascher, "Jerusalems Untergang in der urchristlichen und altkirchlichen Überlieferung," *ThLZ* 89 (1964), 81-98.

² "Die Tempelzerstörung des Jahres 70 in der jüdischen Religionsgeschichte," *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit*, Tübingen, 1950, pp. 144-183, pp. 147, 150. As an indication of the attitude of the later church we can refer to J. Wetherall, *The Destruction of Jerusalem, an absolute and irresistible proof of the divine origin of Christianity: including a narrative of the calamities which befel the Jews, so far as they tend to verify our Lord's predictions relative to that event. With a brief description of the city and temple*, Providence (Miller and Hutchens), 7th American edition, 1818 (originally published London, 1805).

The destruction of the temple represented a major crisis for Judaism.¹ At the same time it was not a crisis which could not be overcome. It will be helpful to distinguish at least three different important conceptions associated with the temple: the place of the presence of God, the place of the cult, and the sign of election. With regard to the first the expansion of the Old Testament Zion tradition had long since prepared the way for the conception that the Shekinah dwells with the people of Israel even apart from the temple. A story which shows both the problem and the solution with respect to the temple cult is found in ARN 4: When his pupil R. Joshua exclaimed at the sight of the temple in ruins, "Woe is us, for the place where the iniquities of Israel were atoned is destroyed," Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai replied, "Do not grieve, my son, for we have a means of atonement which is like it, deeds of mercy (*gemiluth chasadim*), as the scripture says, 'For I desire mercy and not sacrifice.' " Atonement in Judaism always had presupposed *contritio cordis*, *confessio oris*, *restitutio operis*, and now that the actual *absolutio* was gone, equivalents to sacrifice could effectively if at first agonizingly be found.² The real problem of the destruction of the temple lay in the question of election.³ Ever since the time of Antiochos IV, loyalty to Israel had been expressed in terms of loyalty to the temple.⁴ When the temple was destroyed, the church triumphantly claimed this as a sign of the rejection of Israel, and this was the major theme of discussion between church and syna-

¹ Herein we must disagree with the oft repeated thesis of Bousset-Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, Tübingen, 1926³, p. 113. On the effect of the loss of the temple cf. especially Schoeps, "Zerstörung", Helfgott (note 3), pp. 42 ff.; Neusner, *Yohanan*, pp. 129 ff. For the means whereby the crisis of the loss was overcome, cf. the works mentioned p. 1, note 3 and especially A. Büchler, *Studies in Sin and Atonement in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century*, Oxford, 1928. A recent study is J. R. Brown, *Temple and Sacrifice in Rabbinic Judaism*, Evanston, 1964.

² Sacrifice was not the real issue, and it may even have continued on the site of the temple after the destruction; cf. K. W. Clark, "Worship in the Jerusalem Temple after A.D. 70," *NTS* 6 (1960), 269-280.

³ A very important study is B.W. Helfgott, *The Doctrine of Election in Tannaitic Literature*, New York, 1954. The question of election is also emphasized by Schoeps.

⁴ Cf. M. Hengel, *Die Zeloten*, Leiden, 1961. It was the temple, through the participation of all Israel in the temple tax, the *ma'amadim* and the great festivals, which held all the various groups together, in Israel and the Diaspora, as one people.

gogue in the second century.¹ Unfortunately, the present study cannot go into this whole controversy, but our concentration on attitudes to the fall of Jerusalem before the event may help to provide an important background for the later disputes.

It should perhaps be made clear at the outset that the present work has very few points of contact with the seemingly similar study of S. C. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church*.² Brandon tries to show the great importance of the fall of Jerusalem for the history of the New Testament church. While we can sympathize with his insistence on the importance of the problem, we cannot at all agree with his reconstruction of the history of the earlier period, which involves a revival of Eisler's thesis that Jesus was allied with the Zealots and the Tübingen thesis of a deep chasm between Paul and the Jerusalem church. On the whole, however, our interest will be in terms of the importance of the fall of Jerusalem in the exegesis of the synoptic gospels and not in the history of the early church. Two dissertations have been devoted to the theme of Jerusalem and the temple in the New Testament. The following will show how radically we will have to disagree with both. Townsend³ tries to show a veneration of the temple on the part of the first Christian generation, and de Young⁴ devotes a whole chapter to the theme of the rejection of Jerusalem

¹ Schoeps, *Religionsgespräch*, pp. 33f., lists as theses belonging "zum dogmatischen Bestand aller christlichen Kirchen" the following: "Die Auserwählung Israels sei mit der Ablehnung und Kreuzigung des erschienenen Messias Jesus aus Nazareth auf die christliche Kirche übergegangen und die Kirche heisse nunmehr das wahre Israel. Die Straffolge für die Kreuzigung Jesu sei die Zerstörung des Tempels zu Jerusalem als Ausdruck für die von Gott her erfolgte Verwerfung des Volkes Israel, das ob seiner Verstockung unerlöst durch die Welt irren müsse bis zum Wiederkunft des Herrn."

² London, 1957². On F. Spadafora, *Gesù e la Fine di Gerusalemme*, Rovigo, 1950, cf. below, p. 484, note 3.

³ J. T. Townsend, *The Jerusalem Temple in New Testament Thought*, Diss., Harvard Divinity School, 1958. He concludes, p. 286, "It has been established that every writing, or tradition within a writing, which can be shown to stem from before the fall of Jerusalem indicates an acceptance by its author of the Jerusalem temple as God's house and of its cult as a legitimate worship in which Christians as well as Jews have a share. Those writings, or parts of writings, which reflect the opinion of one who writes after the fall of Jerusalem reveal differing attitudes toward its Temple and cult; and in these attitudes can be seen various Christian answers to the question, 'Why did God allow his temple to be destroyed?'"

⁴ J. C. de Young, *Jerusalem in the New Testament; The Significance of the City in the History of Redemption and in Eschatology*, Kampen, 1960.

in the New Testament. If the first betrays a strong apologetic interest in the sacraments, the second involves a very uncritical use of New Testament texts. Our disagreement with both will become apparent in the body of the study.

In view of the great importance of the fall of Jerusalem, it is strange how seldom it should be mentioned in the New Testament. As Moffatt ¹ said over a generation ago, "We should expect that an event like the fall of Jerusalem would have dented some of the literature of the primitive church, almost as the victory at Salamis has marked the *Persae*. It might be supposed that such an epoch-making crisis would even furnish criteria for determining the dates of some of the New Testament writings. As a matter of fact, the catastrophe is practically ignored in the extant Christian literature of the first century." There is no unambiguous reference to the fall of Jerusalem anyplace outside the gospels,² and therefore our investigation will be restricted to them. Although our concern is not with problems of New Testament introduction, it may be that part of the reason for this surprising silence of the rest of the New Testament is to be found in the hypothesis that very few of the New Testament writings were composed after A.D. 70.³ More relevant however is the fact that the New Testament was written primarily for Gentile Christians, for whom the fall of Jerusalem was not a relevant concern.⁴ Only in the gospels do we have the tradition of the preaching of the Palestine church, which must have spoken within Israel of the coming catastrophe. Of course this means that we shall be speaking of the fall of Jerusalem and the temple in terms of real predictions before the event, whereas scholarship has usually suspected that the synoptic predictions were *vaticinia ex eventu*. This will be one of the greatest problems of our investigation, and one which has not received sufficient attention. As Bultmann ⁵ says,

¹ *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, Edinburgh, 1918³, p. 3.

² "Die Synoptiker sind die einzigen Schriften des Neuen Testaments die uns das Urtheil der Christen über den Untergang Jerusalems bezeugen," H. Windisch, "Untergang," p. 525.

³ Cf. C. F. D. Moule, *The Birth of the New Testament*, New York, 1962, pp. 121-123.

⁴ According to M. Simon, *Verus Israel: étude sur les relations entre Chrétiens et Juifs dans l'Empire Romain*, Paris, 1948, it was not even of concern to the Diaspora; therefore Simon really begins his important study with the period after A.D. 135.

⁵ R. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, Göttingen, 1958⁴, p. 126.

“Die Weissagung von der Tempelzerstörung bedarf einer umfassenden Untersuchung.”

2. QUESTIONS

A discussion of the fall of Jerusalem before the event in the synoptic gospels opens up at least three distinct and seemingly unrelated areas of New Testament theology. It is hoped that they will be of interest in themselves, even if their relationship to one another is not always clear.

a) The first is the connection of the fall of Jerusalem with eschatology, as this is expressed mainly in Mark 13. As an adequate form-critical discussion of this chapter has never been written, Chapter II will be devoted to this task. After this analysis we shall find that we are not at all able to answer the question before a number of special studies are made. In particular it will be necessary to discuss separately the question of the fall of the temple (Chapter III) and the fall of Jerusalem (Chapter IV). Accordingly, we shall not be able to suggest an answer to the eschatological question until the concluding Chapter V.

b) In discussing the fall of the temple it is important to understand the attitude of Jesus and the early church toward the temple altogether. Accordingly Chapter III will be devoted to the saying of Jesus Mark 14: 58 that he would destroy the temple made with hands and build another not made with hands. Here in particular a great many common misconceptions must be removed. Is the saying a genuine saying of Jesus? What is the background for the strange statement that the Messiah would destroy the temple? What could possibly be meant by “building” a temple “not made with hands”? The temple represented a) the place of the sacrificial cult, and b) the place of the presence of God. Discussion of the Christian understanding of these two important questions will occupy us in Chapter III.

c) Predictions of the fall of Jerusalem are found primarily in the Gospel according to Luke. What is their significance? What was the attitude of Jesus and the early church to the political situation of Israel in the first century A. D.? In order to answer these questions Chapter IV will be devoted to a special study of Luke-Acts. It is to be hoped that this chapter will contribute toward the understanding of Luke also apart from the question of the fall of Jerusalem.

d) After our investigation of these three disparate but crucial areas of New Testament theology, there will be a number of unanswered questions. Chapter V will attempt to discuss them and if possible to show the inner relationship of all that has gone before. This will mean that some of the chapter can be confined to a summary conclusion, while some fresh questions that have opened up (Son of Man, New Testament prophecy) will require more extensive discussion. Finally, we hope to show briefly how the major themes of the present study: eschatology, the temple cult, and judgment on Jerusalem, come together in the Gospel according to Mark.

The most important question of all goes beyond the bounds of the present study and can be answered only by implication. This is the question of the fall of Jerusalem as the rejection of Israel. A full discussion of this question would involve extensive study in the early patristic and Tannaitic period, but the synoptic material would be an indispensable background. We hope then at least by implication to answer a firm "No" to this question of whether the synoptic tradition teaches the rejection of Israel. If we have only provided the background for a further discussion between the church and the synagogue of the theme: fall of Jerusalem, and thus to have contributed in a small way to their mutual understanding, we shall be satisfied.

CHAPTER TWO

ANALYSIS OF MARK 13

There is perhaps no one single chapter of the synoptic gospels which has been so much commented upon in modern times as Mark 13. The history of its interpretation from D. F. Strauss to the present has been so well documented by G. R. Beasley-Murray¹ that I may perhaps be excused from repeating it here. In spite of the great bulk of writing, however, discussion of this chapter has until now remained fruitless because of a failure to consider it from the point of view of form-criticism. The two main critical camps have been too much occupied with a polemic against each other even to consider the prehistory of the chapter, or rather their basic assumptions imply that there was no prehistory. On the one hand, writers such as Beasley-Murray himself, who are primarily concerned with defending the genuineness of the chapter as a speech of Jesus, are not interested in the transmission of the material at all, except to maintain its faithfulness. On the other hand, the supporters of the little-apocalypse theory, in recent times represented by Hölscher and Bultmann,² believe that a Jewish apocalypse has been provided with a few Christian additions and incorporated into the gospel tradition from outside, so that they are no longer concerned with it. Related to the first group are Schniewind and Busch,³ who have given us perhaps the best writing on the chapter by emphasizing its place in the context of the gospel. Yet they are so concerned with correcting the abuses of the little-apocalypse theory that they

¹ *Jesus and the Future*, 1954; this book has been followed by a detailed exegesis, *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen*, 1957.

² G. Hölscher, "Der Ursprung der Apokalypse Mk 13," *Th. Bl.* 121 (1933), col. 193-202. R. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, 1958⁴, p. 129f. Cf. also E. Klostermann, *Das Markusevangelium*, Hdb. z. N.T., 1950⁴. Although his conceptions of the pre-history of the chapter have been simply taken over from Bultmann (p. 108), W. Marxsen, *Der Evangelist Markus*, 1956, has some valuable contributions to make to the interpretation of the chapter in the context of Mark's gospel, as does H. Conzelmann, "Geschichte und Eschatologie nach Mc 13," *ZNW* 50 (1959), pp. 210-221. The analysis by V. Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 1952, pp. 498ff, 636ff, is really only a more complicated version of the little apocalypse theory.

³ J. Schniewind, *Das Evangelium des Markus*, NTD, 1951⁵; F. Busch, *Zum Verständnis der synoptischen Eschatologie; Markus 13 neu untersucht*, 1938.

remain on the defensive as far as the earlier tradition of the chapter is concerned—indeed, they refuse to discuss the question almost as a matter of principle. Other more recent writers on the question¹ have realized the impossibility of a source criticism of the chapter, but they do little more than suggest that it is built up out of words of Jesus, (Jewish) apocalyptic elements, and sayings of the early church or Christian prophets. It is with tracing the prehistory of Mark 13 in detail that the present chapter is concerned.

That our task will be especially complicated lies in the nature of the material. If Jesus expected the world to continue to exist after his own death, then we may reasonably expect that he spoke to his disciples about this period. On the other hand, if the experience of the early church had any influence at all on the material transmitted, then this influence must have made itself most strongly felt in connection with predictions of the period through which the early church was actually living. The fact that Jesus was felt to be the Lord who had spoken in the Scriptures and who was still speaking to his church through the Holy Spirit complicates the problem even more. It is, however, a much too easy solution to brand all the gospel words which have an application to the life of the church as products of this church, a temptation to which Bultmann often succumbs, or to tend with Beasley-Murray to deny altogether the influence of the church's experience on the vital traditions she transmitted. Very often we will have to be content with a *non liquet* to this problem, to say as Isaac did of Jacob: the voice is the voice of the church, but the thought is the thought of Jesus. There are, however, some principles which can be followed, and part of our task will be to trace the history of the transmission of the material which is contained in Mark 13 if possible even back to its origin in the teaching of Jesus.

All discussion of the gospel tradition is rendered especially complicated by the necessity of moving simultaneously on several levels: that of the meaning of the gospel text as it stands in context, that of the teaching of Jesus as it is more or less accurately therein reflected, and that of the transformations of the tradition in the intervening period. While it is with the third of these levels that

¹ E. Lohmeyer, *Das Evangelium des Markus*, 1951²; W. G. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfillment*, 1956³; G. Harder, "Das eschatologische Geschichtsbild der sogenannten kleinen Apokalypse Markus 13," *Theologia Viatorum*, 1952, pp. 71ff.

we will here be most concerned, it is impossible to work on one level without constant reference to the others. While certain observations about the teaching of Jesus and the theology of Mark will be noted in passing, the implications of these observations will be deferred until a later point. The purpose of this chapter will have been achieved if at the end we are able to reconstruct a history of the tradition lying behind Mark 13. This will necessitate first a rather detailed examination of the present text, with enough reference to the parallel passages in Matthew and Luke to bring out the peculiarities of Mark. Indulgence must also be asked at this point for the assumption that Luke 21 contains an independent tradition to which verses from Mark have later been added.¹ A discussion of the theory of Proto-Luke will be found in Chapter IV, but an anticipation is necessary here at all points where light is thrown on the Markan version. We shall begin then with an examination of the present text of Mark 13, to be followed by form-critical considerations and a reconstruction of the earlier history of the material.

I. ANALYSIS

Mark 13:1-4

1 And as he was going out of the temple one of his disciples said to him: "Teacher, see what great stones and what great buildings!" 2 And Jesus said to him: "You see these great buildings? There will not be left here stone upon stone which will not be thrown down." 3 And while he was seated on the Mount of Olives, vis-à-vis the temple, Peter and James and John and Andrew questioned him privately: 4 "Tell us, when will this be? and what will be the sign when all this is about to be completed?"

Verses 1-2 are an example of what Bultmann calls an *apophthegma*. Both Bultmann and Lohmeyer believe that verse 1 has been composed by Mark to provide a setting for the saying in verse 2. With the necessary reservations, this view is confirmed by a consideration of Luke 21: 5-6, which I believe to be an independent tradition.

¹ The Lukan text minus the Markan additions is to be found in Luke 21: 5-7, 20, 21b-22, 23b-24, 10-11, 25-28, plus the separate tradition in Luke 21: 12-15, 18-19. The details underlying the assumption that this text represents a version of the apocalyptic discourse independent of Mark may be found in my article "Sondergut und Markusstoff in Luk. 21," *ThZ* 16 (1960), pp. 162-172.

"And when people were speaking about the temple, how it was adorned with beautiful stones and votive offerings, he said: 'That which you see—days are coming in which there will not be left here stone upon stone which will not be thrown down.'" A comparison of the two versions shows that what was remembered was the striking prediction which Jesus made that "there will not be left here stone upon stone which will not be thrown down." The fact that this saying was given a slightly different significance in different groups has led to the differences in the conception of the setting. Mark and Luke have no doubt given literary form to the tradition, but that a tradition was there is shown by the essential agreement of the two versions, although the only words they have in common are provided by the saying itself. The difference involved is whether this prediction of the destruction of the temple is considered eschatologically, as directed against the temple itself, which must be destroyed as part of the last judgment to make room for something else; or conversely whether this word is directed against the people of Jerusalem as a threatened judgment within history. In the former case we should expect the prediction to be made secretly as part of an apocalyptic instruction to the disciples, and this is what we find in Mark. In the latter case we should expect a prophetic *Drohwort* to the public, as in Luke. The usual explanation is that Luke is dependent for these two verses only on Mark, whom he has freely paraphrased, but the similarities and differences are much more readily explained if a saying of Jesus has been transmitted in two independent and disparate settings.¹

Verses 3-4 were recognized by K. L. Schmidt² as being a composition of the evangelist joining the saying against the temple with the following eschatological discourse. The fact that this revelation

¹ Luke did modify his source to agree more closely with Mark in 21:7, which is more appropriate to the following discourse to the disciples. This is a further indication that the conception of an address to the public cannot be an editorial modification of Luke but must come from his non-Markan source. Even in Vs 7 there are indications of this earlier understanding: so the non-eschatological γίνεσθαι and the address διδάσκαλε, which is used 11 times in Luke but never by the disciples, for whom ἐπίστατε or κύριε is reserved.

² *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, 1919, p. 290. For the literary form, cf. D. Daube, "Public Retort and Private Explanation," *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, 1956, pp. 141-150. Cf. Mk 4:10; 7:17; 10:10; and perhaps 9:11, 28.

should take place on a mountain is significant,¹ and even more so that it should be the Mount of Olives.² Bultmann³ perversely thinks that the names of the four disciples may be original. We have here, however, probably only a case of the three pillar apostles (Galatians 2:9) or the three main disciples (Mk 5:37, 9:2, 14:33), with the addition of Andrew for a reason unknown to us. The question put to Jesus is not a double one, asking first about the fall of the temple, and then a question tailored to the following discourse, but a single question in parallel form. Already ταῦτα refers to a complex of events, and συντελεῖσθαι is correctly interpreted by Matthew as συντελεῖα τοῦ αἰῶνος.⁴ It is assumed by the disciples, according to Mark, that the fall of Jerusalem and the end of the world are related, even simultaneous events.

Any discussion of the form-critical background of Mark 13: 1-4 is greatly aided by the recognition of an independent parallel tradition in Luke 21: 5-6, where the same saying is given in quite a different setting. This conclusion is supported by a third variant of the saying found in Luke 19:44, where Jesus addresses the city, saying that days will come when "they will not leave stone upon stone in thee" (οὐκ ἀφήσουσιν λίθον ἐπὶ λίθον ἐν σοί). The correspondence of this saying with that found in Mark 13:2 and Luke 21:6 is so close that it is amazing that to my knowledge the parallel has never been noted before. The influence of Mark's setting, even when it has been recognized as secondary, has been so strong that commentators have found a parallel only with the temple saying Mark 14:58, in spite of the great verbal differences.⁵ The saying itself, however, contains no reference to the temple at all, and this should not be assumed from a setting in Mark which is recognized to be secondary. Whether the saying referred originally to the temple or to the city as a whole is a question which must be investigated in some detail. For the present it is enough to observe that the future of the temple or city involves Israel much more than the church, and that the form of the tradition which preserves a public setting,

¹ Cf. Mk 3:13f; 9:2ff; Mt 5:1ff; 28:16ff; and W. Schmauch, *Orte der Offenbarung und der Offenbarungsort im Neuen Testament*, 1965, pp. 58ff.

² Cf. Ezek 11:23; Zech 14; and Schmauch, *op. cit.*, pp. 62ff.

³ *Syn. Trad.*, p. 370.

⁴ A term he probably has from Dn 12:13; cf. further Test Levi 10; syrBar 59:8.

⁵ For a discussion of the temple saying Mk 14:58 par, cf. below, pp. 66-74; for the passage Lk 19:44 in context, cf. below, pp. 355-360.

with the words of Jesus addressed to the people of Jerusalem, is therefore much more likely to be original. This has important consequences for our judgement of Mark 13:1-4. The writer of these verses retained from the original story only the saying itself! Everything else has been altered: the place of the following discourse, the questioners and the audience, and the nature of the question. These verses are, therefore, not to be used as a source for the life of Jesus, but with their apocalyptic presuppositions—the situation on the Mount of Olives, the select initiates who receive the revelation, and the question about the end of the world—they are very significant for the question of the traditions of the following discourse. Matthew in editing Mark has only made this apocalyptic setting clearer.

Mark 13:5-8

5 And Jesus began to say to them:

Watch that no one leads you astray.

6 For many will come (in my name) saying that "I am he" and they will lead many astray.

7 And when you hear of wars and rumors of wars do not be alarmed.

For "this must take place," but it is not yet the end.

8 For "nation will rise against nation and kingdom against kingdom." There will be earthquakes in various places, there will be famines.

These are the beginnings of the pangs.

Mark begins the section with his favorite pleonastic *ἡρξάτο* + *inf.*¹ The natural way to continue verses 1-4, however, would be with *ἀποκριθεὶς*, to which Matthew has even changed Mark. Verse 5a looks very much like the introduction to a new section, and is perhaps a further indication of the fact that the following discourse once existed by itself and that the introduction has been later composed to provide it with a setting referring to the temple. It is significant that the first word of the discourse proper should be *βλέπετε*. This word runs like a *Leit-motiv* through the chapter, appearing again in verses 9, 23 and 33. The fact that it is not reproduced by Matthew or Luke in the latter three cases only underlines the importance of this word in Mark, and suggests that it had this importance even more in an earlier context than in the chapter

¹ It appears 26 times in Mark, of which Matthew has taken over only 6 and Luke only 2. According to M. Black, *Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, 1954, p. 91, it is probably an Aramaism.

in which Matthew and Luke have read it. Verse 6 is difficult to understand and has led many advocates of the little apocalypse theory to suppose a Christian interpolation in a Jewish document. There is in fact an interpolation, or better a confusion between two conceptions, that of false prophets¹ ("in my name") and that of false Messiahs ("saying that 'I am he'").² Either conception is just as understandable in the primitive Christian context as in a Jewish apocalypse, but we cannot read both of them together, and if this chapter ever existed in a form in which it was not part of the gospel tradition, then the first phrase, being in the first person, must be secondary. Both Matthew and Luke seem to have read a γάρ in Mark, and it is very probable that this should be read along with AD itsyr al.³ Logically, the γάρ here is necessary, for it indicates the reason for the warning of verse 5. Verse 7a is again exhortation. It is conceivable that Daniel has influenced the formulation, with the mention of "wars and rumors of wars"⁴; in any case it is very appropriate to the situation in which Mark is supposed to have written, near the time of Nero's death. Verse 7b is an attempt similar to 2 Thes to dampen eschatological fevers by an appeal to an objective plan, on which we stand in but a preliminary stage. Verse 8 has often been thought a doublet of 7 in the third person, but it is not. As the γάρ shows, verse 8 is the proof-text for 7. The Roman church is in a period of universal upheaval, but they should know that this has been planned, for . . . and here is quoted a well-known saying based on Isaiah 19:2,⁵ plus other prophetic signs of the woes of the last days. The paragraph closes with a remark which

¹ k reads here pseudoprophetae!

² Matthew has interpreted correctly, for ἐγὼ εἰμι = **אני הוה**, cf. Dt 32:39; Is 41:4; 43:13ff, 26, and often; Mk 14:62; Jn 8:58. Cf. W. Manson, "The ἐγὼ εἰμι of the Messianic Presence in the New Testament," *JTS* 48 (1947), pp. 137-145; C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, 1953, pp. 93ff; D. Daube, "The 'I am' of the Messianic Presence," *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, pp. 325-329; E. Stauffer, *Jesus, Gestalt und Geschichte*, 1957, pp. 130ff.

³ The case for γάρ in 7b is even stronger: **ⲛⲉ** ADL itsyr.

⁴ Dn 11:44. As we shall see, it is probable that the Vs 14-18 were first formulated about the year A.D. 40, and it is conceivable that an earlier form of these Vs 5-8 were already then connected with the Caligula affair. This would give special meaning to the phrase about rumors of wars, Cf. Josephus, B.J., II, 187. Daniel (2:28) is in any case the source of the phrase in Vs 7b.

⁵ According to K. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew*, 1954, p. 79, this Vs comes from the MT of Is 19:2 only, which has been "targumized" by the church with no influence from 2 Chron 15:6 LXX.

in terms of an exhortation that this is only the beginning sums up its apocalyptic content: the traditional birth-pangs of the Messiah.¹

We must raise once more the form-critical question. The backbone of the paragraph is provided by the exhortation to watch and yet not to anticipate the end too soon. As a basis for the exhortation reference is made to apocalyptic commonplaces, but the latter are only secondary supporting statements. We have here eschatological paraclesis grounded in apocalyptic instruction, in the form:

paraclesis (5b)
 gar — ground (6)
 paraclesis (7a)
 gar — ground (7b)
 gar — ground (8a)
 paraclesis (8b)

The eschatological paraclesis can be found already in the teaching of Jesus in the parables of watchfulness, although as we shall see it underwent constant actualization by the prophets of the early church. With respect to the reasons given for the exhortation, it is not enough to say that they represent apocalyptic commonplaces. It is true that we find a strong influence of the Old Testament in Vs 7-8a (Dn 11:44; 2:28; Is 19:2) and even a technical term from the later apocalyptic ("beginning of the pangs"), but the order in which these events are described is not dependent solely on their present subordinate function of supporting the paraclesis. The order: 1 false prophets, 2 war, 3 earthquakes, and 4 famines, a pattern of four woes just before mention of persecution (Vs 9ff), corresponds so strikingly to the pattern found in Rev 6 that Charles² has stated:

¹ Even if this term is not to be found in the Rabbinic writings, where it is always **חבלו של משיח** in the singular, for this difference lies rather in the Greek language, which prefers *ᾠδίνες* in the plural. These pangs were thought of in Rabbinic theology to usher in the Messianic times, not the world-to-come. Could the origin of this phrase in Christian theology possibly lie in a mistranslation? Acts 2:24 speaks of Christ loosing the "cords of death", a manner of speaking used also in Ps 116:3. Whether Luke turned to the LXX (Ps 114:3), or misunderstood himself the Aramaic **חבלי**, the result is the introduction of the term *ᾠδίνες* into the tradition, pangs which begin with the death of Christ. Then Is 66:7 must have had a special significance for the Christian: "Before she was in labor, she gave birth; before her pain came upon her she was delivered of a son" (cf. Rev 12:3-5).

² R. H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John*, ICC, 1920, Vol I, p. 159. Cf. further M. Rissi, "The Rider on the White Horse," *Interpretation* 18 (1964), pp. 407-418, esp. pp. 413f.

"the conclusion that our text (Rev 6) is dependent on the Gospel accounts, or rather on the document behind them, seems irresistible." Luke 21:10f, with its mention of pestilence, is in some respects even closer to Rev, and it is probable that Luke is not dependent on Mark at this point but represents a third version of a common apocalyptic pattern. We see then that a rather complicated development lies behind this section of Mark.

Mark 13:9-13

9 But watch yourselves!

A. *For* they will *deliver* you over to sanhedrins, and you will be beaten in synagogues, and you will be brought before governors and kings for my sake as a witness against them 10 and all the nations.

(The gospel must first be proclaimed.)

B. 11 And when they *deliver* you up and bring you to trial, do not be concerned beforehand what you will say, but speak that which will be given to you in that hour.

For it will not be you who speak but the Holy Spirit.

C. 12 And brother will *deliver* up brother to death and the father his child, and children will revolt against their parents and kill them. 13 And you will be hated by all because of my name.

But he who endures to the end will be saved.

This section is an example of what E. G. Selwyn¹ calls a "persecution-form" bracketed between two characteristic exhortations: βλέπετε in Vs 9a and the injunction to ὑπομονή in Vs 13b. The body of the section seems to be made up of three sayings on persecution joined by the catchword "deliver up", with the addition of clearly secondary elements. The sayings themselves represent a theme widespread in the early church, a fact which will be significant for our discussion of sources. For easier reference the most important parallels follow:

Matthew 10:17-23

17 But beware of men,

For they will deliver you over to sanhedrins and they will scourge you in their synagogues; 18 and you will be led before governors and kings for my sake, as a witness against them and the nations.

19 When they deliver you up, do not be anxious how or what you will speak, for it will be given to you in that hour what you shall say.

¹ *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, 1947², pp. 439ff.

20 For it will not be you who speak but the spirit of your Father speaking in you.

21 And brother will deliver up brother to death, and the father his child, and children will revolt against their parents and kill them. 22 And you will be hated by all because of my name.

But he who endures to the end will be saved.

23 When they persecute you in this town flee to the next, for truly I say to you, you will not finish the cities of Israel before the Son of Man comes.

Luke 21:12-15, 18f

12 But before all these things they shall lay their hands on you and persecute you, delivering you up to synagogues and prisons, leading you before kings and governors for the sake of my name.

13 It shall turn out for you as a witness. 14 Therefore put it in your hearts not to be concerned beforehand about replying in defense.

15 For I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries will not be able to withstand or contradict. 18 And not a hair of your heads will be lost. 19 In your endurance you will save your lives.

Luke 12:11-12

11 When they bring you before synagogues and rulers and authorities, do not be anxious how or what you will reply in defense or what you will say, 12 for the Holy Spirit will teach you in that hour what you must say.

Matthew 24:9-14

9 Then they will deliver you over to tribulations and they will kill you, and you will be hated by all the nations because of my name.

10 And then many shall stumble and deliver up one another and hate one another. 11 And many false prophets will arise and lead many astray. 12 And because of the increase of lawlessness the love of many will grow cold. 13 But he who endures to the end will be saved.

14 And this gospel of the kingdom will be proclaimed in the whole world as a witness to all the nations, and then the end will come.

It is usually held that Matthew has rolled his copy of Mark forward in order to copy Mt 10: 17-22 from Mk 13:9-13, a rash act which he was to regret when he came to his chapter 24, for he was then forced to invent new material to keep from repeating himself. That it was the urge to avoid repetition, and the fact that there was a plentiful supply of parallel material to draw from, which led him to neglect Mark largely in his composition of Mt 24:9-14 can be readily admitted. It is only the first part of the supposition

which seems to be improbable and unnecessary. The Vss. in question have an excellent connection in Mt 10, where Matthew is collecting material dealing with the problems of the young missionary church. That he has an eschatological prospect at the end (10:23) is characteristic for predictions of persecutions. Mark however, by his position, emphasizes the eschatological element much more, for he is here considering persecutions only from the point of view of signs of the end. It is at least possible that Matthew is here not directly dependent on Mark, but that both have the same oral source in common.¹ Already the fact that the three sayings are joined by the catch-word "deliver up" points to the situation of oral transmission, and the eschatological promise of consolation at the end, especially in Mt 10, is an indication of who the transmitters were and the use to which the sayings were put.

The situation in Luke 21:12-19 is much plainer. If we except Vs 16f, he has not a single phrase in common with Mark except εἰς μαρτύριον, and this is used in quite a different meaning! Lk 12:11f is much closer to the saying Mk 13:11, yet this surely does not represent any literary dependance. It is further to be observed that Lk 21:12-15, 18-19 is a literary unity with a uniform thought, one much less pessimistic than Mark. If it be objected that this prediction does not take enough account of the martyrdoms mentioned in Acts, one must say that Luke agreed and for this very reason added these two verses from Mark. In the original form of Luke we have therefore a parallel tradition to that of Mark, which can be compared in our form-critical analysis. But this is not all, for as we have mentioned there is another parallel in Q Lk 12:11-12. It is evident that sayings about persecution, including a promise of speedy deliverance, were especially treasured by the early church, and that we therefore are here dealing with the same set of sayings transmitted along several different independent lines.

Mk 13:9 does not show a significant variation in the several sources, but it is capable of being interpreted in different ways. The kings (cf Mk 6:4) and governors (Mt 27:2, Acts 23:24) can be understood of a Palestinian *milieu*, but on the other hand this verse describes the persecutions of, for example, Paul exactly.² We know from many other sayings that Jesus predicted persecution for his

¹ Cf. B. Reicke, "Den primäre israelsmissionen och hednamissionen enligt synoptikerna," *Svensk theol. kvartalskr.* 26 (1950), pp. 77ff.

² Cf. Lohmeyer, *Mk*, p. 272; Bultmann, *syn. Trad.* p. 129.

followers, and yet *a priori* there is no other class of sayings we should expect to be more affected by the experiences of the transmitters. That this saying was in any case well known among the early Christians is shown not only by its being transmitted along four different channels, but also by the fact that it can be appealed to as a ground for watching, introduced by γάρ.¹ The difficulty begins with Vs 9b: εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. The meaning of Lk 21:13 on the other hand is plain: the disciples will have opportunity to bear witness about Christ before the heathen, in accordance with the missionary program of Second Isaiah. The connection with the following is thus clear and logical in Luke, and we see that the μαρτύριον is to be understood as a successful ἀπολογία. Mark by adding αὐτοῖς² seems to bring the phrase in a more concise form and to connect it more closely with the preceding, but actually he changes the meaning thereby. As Strathmann has shown,³ it can only be understood in the sense of Mk 6:11: the objective injustice inflicted on the Christians witnesses against their persecutors, who are thereby judged. This is a thought to be found elsewhere in the New Testament, but it has nothing to do with what is said by the Spirit through the disciples in Vs 11. We shall, therefore, suggest that Mt 10 and Mk 13 are secondary with respect to Lk 21.⁴

It is generally agreed by modern commentators⁵ that Vs 10b is non-genuine and secondary in its context, but it is not always made clear what this could mean. To say that the saying could not

¹ In all MSS but B syrsin pc. The phrase has of course undergone transformations in the course of its transmission, of which we can mention here the words ἐνεκεν ἐμοῦ, which can be shown by a synoptic comparison to have been often added to the original tradition, cf. Mt 5:11 and Lk 6:22, Mt. 7:22 and Lk 13:26, and Mt 10:39 and Lk 17:33. We have already seen that the words "in my name" in Vs 6 are probably secondary.

² And probably καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. This is the connection in the tradition of Mt 10:18. All of the ancient versions also understood Mk in this way, as did those Greek MSS which have inserted a δέ after πρῶτον:WΘal. Cf G. D. Kilpatrick, "The Gentile Mission in Mark and Mk 13:9-11," *Studies in the Gospels*, ed. D. E. Nineham, 1955, pp. 145-158.

³ *TWNT*, IV, 511.

⁴ G. D. Kilpatrick, op. cit., has suggested the punctuation for Vs 9b-10 which we have adopted, which seems to make 9b clearer, or at least closer to the parallel in Mt. 10:18. But Kilpatrick then goes on to the impossible suggestion that Vs 10b is to be constructed with Vs 11, meaning that the gospel must first be preached before one can be arrested.

⁵ Lohmeyer, *Mk*, p. 272; Taylor, *Mk*, p. 507; Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 84; Marxsen, *Mk*, p. 119f; Harder, "Geschichtsbild", p. 78f; Conzelmann, "Geschichte", p. 218f.

be a word of Jesus brings us away from the point, for there are many reasons which can be brought forward to show that Jesus could have and probably did say something similar.¹ The fact that this verse is not found in the Matthean and Lucan parallels is also not significant if we are right in our supposition that no literary dependence is to be postulated. Yet it cannot have been original in its present context, where it breaks the connection between Vss 9 and 11 and misunderstands thereby Vs 9. As it stands the verse is impossible. What does *πρῶτον* mean? Before the disciples are persecuted (Vs 9)? Before they are delivered up to trial (Vs 11)? The only meaning which makes sense is "before the end," but this is simply not said by Mark. It is further a truism to say that the gospel must be preached before and not after the end; what is meant is that the end will not come until the gospel is proclaimed in the whole world, exactly what is said in Mt 24:14. It is impossible grammar but a sound instinct when Mk 13:10 is usually interpreted unconsciously as if it said the same as Mt 24:14, for this must, indeed, be the source of our verse. Jeremias,² working on quite different premises, has come to the conclusion that Mt is closer to the original (Aramaic) form. It could be that an early scribe missed the thought of a world mission in Mk and inserted here a shortened form of Mt 24:14.³ But this very consideration shows us that the mission commission belongs in this chapter, and it is more likely that it was added earlier. If the Vs 9-13 were at one time part of the gospel tradition, handed down as words of the incarnate Christ, as in the parallels Mt 10 and Lk 12, nevertheless we have reason for believing that at one stage of the tradition they were part of a speech of the risen Christ. In this situation the thought of the world mission was positively required, and we shall suggest that at that time these words from the Matthean version were inserted into their present context. That they were inserted after Vs 9 is because *μαρτύριον* was misunderstood, contrary to its natural meaning here, of a preaching of the gospel. Mk must also have understood the words in this way, but he took them over without alteration, so that we can

¹ Cf. J. Jeremias, *Jesus' Promise to the Nations*, 1956, p. 22f, as opposed to B. Sundkler, *Jésus et les païens*, 1937, p. 11.

² *op. cit.*, p. 23.

³ This was suggested by W. Bousset, "Wellhausens Evangelienkritik," *Theol. Rundschau* 9 (1906), pp. 1-14, 43-51, p. 13; and by A. Jülicher, *Einführung in das Neue Testament*, 1906⁵⁻⁶, p. 547.

still see something of the complicated pre-history of Vs 9b-10.¹

Mk 13:12 is an apocalyptic commonplace² and is often cited as evidence that our chapter is based on a Jewish apocalypse. That this opposition between (Jewish) apocalypse and (Christian) gospel is not a legitimate one, however, is shown by the fact that this saying, which is based on Mic 7:6, is found also in Q, Lk 12:52f. The fact that not only a breaking up of family bonds is envisaged, but that it is explicitly said that they will deliver one another up to death is probably based on the experiences of the church in the Neronean persecution.³ Vs 13a is paralleled by Lk 6:22 (Q), Lk 1:71, and Jn 15:19f (cf I Jn 3:13), and is, so to speak, a necessary correlate of the final θλίψις. If Jesus spoke about this, and there is good reason to suppose that he did, then this word too could have been spoken by him. Nevertheless, one cannot avoid the impression that this saying fits in more with a world in which the Christians were accused of an *odium generis humani*. 13b betrays more clearly the language of the church: σῶζειν is not otherwise used in Mk or Q in this theological sense (cf Mk 16:16). It is further to be noticed that 13b is a statement belonging to the realm of eschatological paraclesis (cf Act 14:22), and that in such a context a reference to the end and, so to speak, to the reward of the disciple's ὑπομονή is positively required. Dn 12:12 is a close parallel if not the actual source of this saying.⁴

¹ Lk 21:14f is a good example of the fact that his chapter 21 is on the whole not only independent of, but prior to Mk. It is generally agreed that the Lukan form of the Q saying Lk 11:20 "with the finger of God" is more primitive than Mt 12:28 "with the spirit of God." By the same reasoning, "the Holy Spirit" in Mk 13:11 must be secondary to Lk 21:15, where Jesus himself gives the wisdom. In any case, Luke, with his interest in the Holy Spirit, would never omit it from his source, and it must therefore be admitted that he is not following Mark here; cf. the considered arguments of C. K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit in the Gospel Tradition*, 1947, pp. 131ff. If the formulation in Luke is the more primitive, then Mt 10:20, with its unusual "Spirit of your Father", will represent an intermediate position, on the way to the familiar "Holy Spirit" of Mk 13:11 and Lk 12:12. The idea expressed is the same in all parallels (cf. further 1 Cor 12:3), for that the "mouth and wisdom" which Jesus gives is equivalent to the gift of the Spirit is shown by Acts 6:10; 7:10; Lk 2:40 (ὄλ = πνεύματι!); Eph 1:8; 4:7ff; etc.

² Cf. 4 Es 6:2; En 99:5; 100:2; bSanh 97a.

³ Cf. 1 Clem 6:1, "a great crowd of elect, who endured many outrages and tortures because of jealousy" and Tacitus, Ann. XV, 44 "deinde indicio eorum (scil: correpti qui fatebantur) multitudo ingens . . . convicti sunt."

⁴ Lk 21:18f, on the other hand, has quite a different meaning: Vs 18 is a

Although we are not at this point especially concerned with Mt, a few remarks on his text will be in order. We have surmised that in order to avoid repeating himself here, he has drawn on a similar tradition which he felt more appropriate to the context. He seems not to have understood the relation of a persecution to the discourse of Mk 13, and so he has substituted material whose eschatological reference is plainer. That this material belongs to a later stage of the tradition can be shown by the many parallels to his text, of which the most important is Did 16:2-3. We see that the tendency is away from practical instruction and eschatological exhortation to a more factual description of the condition of the church and the world at the end. Even more interesting from our point of view is the way in which sayings of Jesus have been brought closer into line with predictions of scripture, especially to the last chapters of Daniel. Just as the reference is explicit in Mt 24:15 (to Dn 12:11), so here 24:9 is probably influenced by Dn 12:1, 24:10 by Dn 11:41, and 24:13 by Dn 12:12, this latter already in Mk. If it is true that Mt 24:9-14 represents a later development of the tradition than Mk 13:9-13, then this has an important corollary. By the same principles, Mk must be a later development than Lk 21:12-15, 18-19.

What conclusions can be drawn from this section? First, in view of the many parallels in various parts of the gospel tradition, it seems clear that sayings of Jesus about persecution were not only of paramount interest for the early church, but also must have originated with Jesus himself. Second, if the order of development Lk 21 - Mt 10 - Mk 13 - Mt 24 be accepted, we can see how these sayings, which from the very beginning were meant of the persecutions of the last days, take on more and more an eschatological coloring. In Lk 21 it is there only by implication, but in Mt 24 it has almost replaced the element of persecution itself. This change has been brought about not only by an increased study of the scriptures and a more systematized description of the end time, but also by actual experiences of the church. Lk 21:18 must be called, if not an unfulfilled prophecy, at least a very misleading one—as Lk himself realized when he added Vs 16-17. This experience makes itself felt even more strongly in Mt (cf Heb 10:23ff, 1 Clem 5:2ff, etc), but

proverbial saying (Cf. 1 Sm 14:45; 2 Sm 14:11; Lk 12:7; Acts 27:34) which says explicitly that none will be killed, and Vs 19 refers not to martyrdom but to the successful outcome of the trials of the disciples.

already of Mk we can say: The church which transmitted these sayings has known persecution.

Mark 13:14-19,20

14 But when you see the "sacrilege of devastation" standing (sic! let the reader understand!) where it ought not, then those in Judea should flee to the mountains.

15 Let him who is on his house neither come down nor go in to take anything from his house, 16 and let him who is in the field not turn back to take his cloak.

17 But woe to the pregnant and nursing women in those days!

18 and pray that it not happen in winter!

19 For those days will be a "tribulation such as never has been from the beginning of creation" which God created "until now" and never will be.

20 And if the Lord had not shortened the days, no one would be saved. But for the sake of the elect whom he chose he shortened the days.

We come now to the most difficult section of the eschatological discourse, the one which has caused the most varied interpretations of the whole chapter. We are dealing with a prophetic oracle which attempts to see the fulfilment of an Old Testament text in concrete events of the present. While successive events change the understanding of the Old Testament and of the prophetic oracle itself once it has been given formulation, still the actual prophetic words are transmitted as accurately as possible, while they are understood in different ways. In the present case there is not only evidence of reinterpretation in the history of the transmission of the oracle, but there is also the tension introduced by its position in Mark 13. It is not at all clear that Mk 13:14ff was originally meant as an answer to the question of the disciples which begins the chapter, and already an old *catena* comments, "they asked one question, but he answered another."¹ We shall, therefore, ignore for the moment the question and try to see what the answer means considered for itself.

It is clear that the reference to Daniel in Mt 24:15 only makes explicit what is already intended by the Markan text. As the whole sense of the passage is tied to a particular understanding of the Danielic phrase "sacrilege of devastation" (Dn 9:27, 11:31; 12:11), we must look closely at the shifts of meaning involved. In

¹ Quoted in Klostermann, *Mk*, p. 131.

December 167 B. C. Antiochos Epiphanes dedicated the Jerusalem temple to the Syrian "Lord of Heaven", Baal Shamem. According to 1 Mac 1:59, he set up a small βωμός on the burnt-offering altar before the temple, probably a stone fetish such as is found in contemporary Arab cults,¹ but there is no evidence that he introduced a statue of himself or of any god into the temple. Daniel's choice of the words שָׁמַם שָׁקַץ to describe the sacrilege of Antiochos is based on the similarity to שָׁמַם בַּעַל שָׁמַם and is a cacophemistic way of referring to it.² However, as understandable as this must have been to Daniel's contemporaries, his word choice was bound to cause a misunderstanding later, for שָׁקַץ in the Old Testament normally means an idol.³ Thus we find that in the entire Jewish tradition,⁴ and in many of the church fathers, Daniel's שָׁקַץ was interpreted as an idol, i.e. a statue set up in the temple. The LXX have added a further difficulty by their translation of שָׁמַם as ἐρήμωσις. The root שָׁמַם can mean either "to be desolate" or "to be appalled", and it is certainly the latter meaning that Daniel intended.⁵ As long as the context in Daniel is remembered, this mistranslation does not really matter, for during the time of the profanation the city was in fact "deserted" of all loyal Jews.⁶ Nevertheless, the natural meaning of ἐρήμωσις points to a destruction, and as soon as the connection with Daniel was no longer seen, this meaning was bound to come to the fore. It is likely that this fact accounts for the position of Mk 13:14, and so of the whole eschatological discourse Vs 5-37, in the context of the prediction of Vs 2. The shift in meaning of these two words is very significant for understanding the origin of the oracle. While the phrase βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως, once brought into the Christian prophetic tradition, could easily be understood as a "sacrilege of devastation," no one thinking of a destruction from the very beginning would have made any connection with Daniel. The original use of the phrase must therefore have meant such an "appalling sacri-

¹ Cf. E. Bickermann, *Der Gott der Makkabäer*, 1937, esp. pp. 50ff.

² First recognized by E. Nestle, "Der Greuel der Verwüstung, Dan 9:27, 11:31, 12:11," *ZAW* 4 (1884), p. 248.

³ Cf. Jer 13:27; 32:35; 44:22; Ezek 5:9; 11:6; 9; et al.

⁴ Cf. Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, I, p. 951.

⁵ The correct Greek translation should therefore have been from the root ἐκπλάσσω or ἐκίστημι (as in the LXX Jer 2:12; 18:16; Ezek 26:16; 27:35; et al.; but cf. Ez 9:3).

⁶ Cf. 1 Mac 1:38; 3:45 (Ἱεροσολημ ἦν ἀοίκητος ὡς ἐρημος). G. Kittel, *TWNT*, II, 657, manages to interpret ἐρήμωσις in this sense.

lege" as occurred at the time of Daniel but also, in view of the usual meaning of שָׁקִיף, probably involving an idol set up in the temple.

At what time would Daniel's prediction of a profanation of the temple have been of interest to the early church? We must ask first in this cautious way, without any consideration of the "genuineness" of the oracle or of the interpretation required by the context. We do indeed know of such an occasion, in the attempt of Caligula to have his statue set up in the temple in A.D. 39-41.¹ Piganiol and Hölscher² have made this event the point of origin of the Jewish (Christian?) apocalypse they suppose to lie beneath Mark 13, and at least for the Vs 13:14-19, they are very persuasive. One can quite well think of these words being written during the time after Petronius had yielded to the petitions of the Jews and written to the emperor, while all Judea waited anxiously to see what the final decision would be. The writer does not expect the early death of Caligula and warns that when the statue is set up, then "they"³ should flee to the mountains, just as the Maccabees did, to prepare for guerilla warfare.⁴ Vs 15-16 can be readily understood of the necessity for hurried flight,⁵ but the fact that we have a close parallel in Q Lk 17:31 must also be considered. Vs 17 can be understood in almost any context, but seems more likely of an historical than of an eschatological hardship. The prayer that flight may not be made necessary in winter, Vs 18, can be understood by the fact that suspense stood at its highest during the winter of A.D. 40-41, before the report of

¹ Cf. Josephus, B.J., II, 184ff; Ant., XVIII, 242ff; Philo, Leg. ad Gaium, 29-43; Tacitus, Hist. V, 9.

² A. Piganiol, "Observations sur la date de l'apocalypse synoptique," *Rev. d'Hist. et Phil. Rel.* 4 (1924), pp. 245-249; G. Hölscher, "Der Ursprung der Apocalypse Mk 13," *Th. Bl.* 12 (1933), col. 193-202. Knox, *Sources*, I, pp. 103ff, thinks that the reference of these verses to Caligula is quite plain, and also Marxsen, *Mk*, p. 122, thinks that this was their origin.

³ The Christians? The Jews? It is doubtful if a distinction can be made. We have only the fact that this Vs is in the gospel to make us think that it is of Christian origin. But is it then so inconceivable that at least a section of the Jerusalem church should have so sympathized with their fellow countrymen as to share their horror at Caligula's attempt?

⁴ Cf. 1 Mac 2:23ff. Tacitus speaks of preparations for war even before the statue was to have been set up.

⁵ The Maccabees too had to leave all their property behind, cf. 1 Mac 2:28, "He and his sons fled into the mountains and left behind everything they had in the city." The situation presupposed in Vs 15-16 is of life in a village. It is therefore not a question of fleeing the Anti-Christ in Jerusalem, but of preparation for war throughout the province—the Maccabees came not from Jerusalem but from Modein.

Caligula's death arrived.¹ Vs 19 is again from Daniel (12:1), but with the significant addition: "and never will be." These words, which give the reason in a word of scripture for the imperatives of Vs 17-18, show that the original conception was not of the tribulation of the last days. As great as this θλίψις will be, it is nevertheless not to be immediately followed by the end, for time will still go on, with the possibility of other, though lesser, θλίψεις. It is to be noted that these words are not due to the quotation but have been added to Daniel by the author. The section was then originally not apocalyptic at all but was a prophetic oracle giving instruction for a specific historical situation through the actualization of the Old Testament prophet Daniel.

Verse 20 is quite different from the preceding² and is part of the same apocalyptic³ conception we find in Vs 24-27. It not only cannot apply to the Caligula episode, but it also has demonstrably late elements, such as its un-Palestinean use of κύριος (which Mt 24:22 has in the more Semitic passive), and technical use of the word ἐκλεκτοί, who are here suddenly introduced. On the one hand the point of view is narrowed to the Christians, and on the other it is widened to include "all flesh." The proper context of Vs 20 is not with the section now under discussion.

If it is correct that Mk 13:14-19 were especially meaningful to the church in the year 39-41 A.D., then the next question is whether or not they were created at that time. C.C. Torrey⁴ was compelled against his own inclination to admit that 13:14a was *ex eventu statuae Caligulae*, but he supposed that this verse had been altered from an original prediction more like Luke 21:20. Everything else he thought quite understandable in the mouth of Jesus. Similarly, Beasley-Murray, who tries to defend the authenticity of the whole

¹ Cf. B. J. II, 203: χειμασθῆναι. To be sure the warning can have come from the summer of A.D. 40 in anticipation of the winter, as Hölscher, col. 201, thinks.

² Piganiol thought Vs 20 to be an essential part of his argument because of the sudden use of the past tense, which he interpreted of the relief granted when Petronius harkened to the pleas of the Jews and delayed setting up the statue. But this would mean not a shortening but a lengthening of the days! The past tense is actually the Aramaic perfect, just as οὐκ . . . πᾶσα σάρξ is לא כל-בשרא.

³ Cf. En 80:2; 4 Es 4:26; syrBar 20:1. Of course already the θλίψις of Vs 19 is eminently apocalyptic, but it is in a quotation and need not have been so understood.

⁴ *Documents of the Primitive Church*, 1941, pp. 13f.

chapter as a speech of Jesus, has to assume a modification in this verse. If Jesus was speaking of a concrete event, the reference can only be to Pilate's attempt to introduce Roman standards into the temple area,¹ and accordingly the original saying must have been "when you see the ensign of sacrilege, flee to the mountain."² Both of these attempts only emphasize the fact that the authenticity of Vs 14 in its present form cannot be defended as a saying of Jesus. The origin not only of Vs 14 but also of Vs 19 is clearly indicated by their dependence on Daniel, and they can have been formulated only at a time when Daniel's "sacrilege" became timely for the church, namely at the time of Caligula. Vs 15-16 on the other hand contain no allusions from Daniel and have a parallel in the Q tradition, Lk 17:31. This saying urging a hurried and unexpected flight seems strained also in the Lukan context of the coming judgment in terms of a *midrash* on the story of Lot and seems to have been an isolated saying. While the origin of the saying will be discussed in that context, it is enough to say now that it need not have originated in the Caligula crisis, even if the advice is very fitting for the situation threatened in A.D. 40. That we should find here in Mk 13:14-19 sayings of Jesus combined with an application of the Old Testament in such a way as to give an exhortation for a specific situation is typical for the early Christian prophets.

Because we have been concerned about the origin of this prophetic oracle, we have not yet discussed it in its Markan context. The one element which, while it can be interpreted of the affair of Caligula's statue, nevertheless points to a different understanding, is the use of the masculine participle ἐστηκότα to modify the neuter βδέλυγμα. This seems to refer to a personal Anti-Christ, who "takes his seat in the temple of God, proclaiming himself to be God" (2 Thes 2:4). Mk could easily have written more about the Anti-Christ if he had wanted to do so, but he believed the oracle of Vs 14-19 to be a genuine prophecy, and he did not feel he could alter it. He could, however, interpret it, and we have learned from 1 Q pHab that this interpretation could take the form of exploiting a grammatical irregularity or even creating one. Whether or not the original oracle

¹ Josephus, Ant. XVIII, 55ff.

² σημεῖον τοῦ βδελύγματος = 𐤅𐤓𐤕𐤍𐤏𐤃, the idolatrous standards of the approaching Roman army, Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Future*, pp. 255ff. He supports his thesis by the reading of syrsin and the analysis of Merx, *Das Evangelium Matthäus*, 1902, pp. 341ff.

read correctly ἐστὶς,¹ it is fairly certain that Mk thought of a person, and that he indicated this by means of the parenthesis "let the reader understand."² Marxsen says of the origin of this phrase: "in Betracht kommen zwei Möglichkeiten: das Danielbuch... oder aber das apokalyptische Flugblatt."³ Conservative interpreters in general have chosen the first possibility, in harmony with Mt, and Klostermann, Lohmeyer, et al. the second. But there is surely a third possibility, and if we are to interpret the βδέλυγμα of the Anti-Christ it is a strong probability, namely that these words are from Mk to indicate the significance of the grammatical anomaly. They are then similar to such pleading for understanding in connection with mysterious sayings as Rev 13:18; 17:9, and Barn 4:5f. We find often such a parenthesis in Mk, in which he briefly turns from the story he is telling to address his reader directly, to explain something to him or urge his understanding, cf 3:30; 7:3-4, 11b, 19b; 9:50b; 14:9; 16:4b, 8b, etc. It therefore seems probable that Mk is reinterpreting an already existing oracle.

Already before Mark the passage had been given an apocalyptic reference, in spite of the contradictions thus introduced into the material. After the passing of the Caligula crisis prophetic words were still transmitted, but the "appalling sacrilege" was now seen to be the sacrilege of the destruction of the temple, which would usher in the final act of the eschatological drama. Now Vs 15-16 in particular are quite out of place, not only because it is village life and not Jerusalem which is here presupposed, but even more because an injunction to flight implies a crisis within history and not the end.⁴ Even if such a tribulation "never will be" again

¹ As in Mt 24:15, where there is no Anti-Christ. The constructio ad sensum, Blass-Debrunner, § 134, 3, could after all refer to ὁ ἀνδριάνας, the word Josephus uses of the statue.

² That the reader should be urged to understand = בִּין is significant for the context of an eschatological mystery; cf. Dn 1:17; 2:21-23; 9:25; 12:3; Eph 1:8; 3:4; Rm 16:25-27; Col 1:9; 2:2. On the whole subject, cf. the thorough discussion by D. Daube, "The Abomination of Desolation," *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, 1956, pp. 418-437. His attempt to understand the phrase as the apodosis of the ὅταν δὲ ἴδῃτε clause, however, cannot be said to have succeeded.

³ *Mk*, p. 110, following the suggestion of Bultmann, *TWNT*, I, 347. Regarding the present function of the phrase, however, he comes to the same conclusion as we do: "Gleichgültig aus welcher Quelle sie stammt, gleichgültig auch, was sie dort bedeutet hat, Mk denkt an die Leser seines Buches" (p. 125).

⁴ Is there any point in fleeing from the Anti-Christ? Even Lohmeyer is

(Vs 19), time will go on and it is not yet the final tribulation. Whatever the later interpretation, which will be taken up at another point, the oracle of Mk 13:14-19 had originally a quite different and specific reference.

Mk 13:21-23

21 And then if anyone should say to you: "see, here is the Messiah",
"see, there," do not believe it.

22 For false Messiahs and false prophets will arise and will
perform signs and wonders to mislead, if possible, the elect.

23 But you take care!

I have told you all beforehand.

Also the next section, Mk 13:21-23, shows the necessity of a *formgeschichtliche* analysis. If Anti-Christ has already appeared, then there is no room for further false Christs and false prophets.¹ The similarity to, but also the contrast with 2 Thes 2:9 is important: "The coming of the lawless one (N.B. sing.) by the activity of Satan will be with all power and with pretended signs and wonders." It has often been noted that Mk 13:21-23 is a doublet of 13:5f, but this is of significance more as an indication that these passages belong to the same tradition than it is a clue to a Markan composition.² The parallel is even closer to Lk 17:21, "nor will they say, 'See, here it is!' or 'There!'" and 17:23, "And they will say to you, 'See, there!' or 'See, here!' Do not go, do not follow them." to which can be added Mt 7:15 and the warnings against false prophets in the epistles. The form of the language points to the exhortation of the church, for it is the Christians who are being warned and not the disciples. It is further true that the Zealot movement did produce a number of false Messiahs and false prophets, and Mt 24:26 "in the wilderness" (cf Ant XX, 97 f) and "in the inner rooms" (cf B. J. VI, 285) are undoubtedly based on the event. Nevertheless, in view of the widespread belief of the early church that the warning came from Jesus, and with regard to the inherent probability, it

forced to admit, *Mk*, p. 276, "Wohl ist es seltsam, dass der Aufenthalt in den Bergen vor dem Anti-Christ schützen soll."

¹ "Kann nach dem Erscheinen des Antichrists noch gesagt werden: Pseudochristi und Pseudopropheten werden aufstehen?", Lohmeyer, *Mk*, p. 277.

² Thus Marxsen, *Mk*, p. 126, uses the doublet as a clue to understanding the division between past and future in the Markan conception. Taylor, *Mk*, pp. 502f, 515, following many commentators, would like to see thereby different sources indicated.

is possible that Jesus did in fact warn his followers about false prophets.

In any case, we are here concerned with the form of these sayings more than their content and origin, and they provide a perfect example in a compact form of the eschatological exhortation of the early church. First comes a warning to the Christians on a subject which was particularly pertinent. This warning is then grounded in an objective fact to which appeal can be made, introduced by γάρ.¹ The warning, and to some extent the prediction, go back to words of Jesus, but the actual formulation of the latter has been influenced by scripture² and is phrased in the language of the church. Finally, we have the warning repeated in a general form: βλέπετε. Vs 23b is here difficult. We have already suggested that the first person in Vs 6 ("in my name") and 9 ("for my sake") was secondary, and that Christ was not from the beginning thought of as the speaker. If, however, later the perspective of the discourse was put back to the time of Jesus, some such saying as this was required. In common with Vs 37 it shows an awareness that it is really the Christians and not the disciples who are being addressed.

If Vs 21-23 are an example of exhortation, then it is clear that they are not a later interpolation, even if they are parallel to Vs 5f and even if they interrupt an "apocalyptic program," for they belong to the same form-critical category as Vs 5f and undoubtedly to the same stratum in the history of our chapter. Nevertheless, Vs 24 would follow more naturally on Vs 20, and it may be that in one stage of the tradition this was the case. Vs 21-23a will then have been added, quite early, perhaps because of the *Stichwort* ἐκλεκτοί, which appears in Vs 22, but also before, in Vs 20, and afterward, in Vs 27.

Mark 13:24-27

- 24 But in those days, after that tribulation
 the sun will be darkened,
 and the moon will not give its light,
 25 and the stars will be falling from heaven;
 yea, the powers in the heavens will be shaken!
 26 And then they will see "the Son of Man coming in clouds" with
 great power and glory. 27 And then he will send the angels and

¹ γάρ seems to have been read by Mt and stands in all the MSS but NC.

² Dt 13:2 says of a false prophet: καὶ δῶ σοι σημεῖον ἢ τέρας.

gather his elect from the four winds, from the end of the earth (to the end of the earth and from the end of heaven) to the end of heaven.

Vs 24 refers back to the tribulation in Vs 19, which has accordingly been understood in spite of 19b, "and never will be," as the last great woe before the end. After the final tribulation comes the final redemption—so much is clear, and Jesus could have said as much. Yet if there were any sayings of Jesus available telling of the coming of the Son of Man, the author of this section did not know of them, for the source of these sayings is the Old Testament. Given the belief that the Old Testament is inspired scripture and that Jesus is the Son of Man, this is not in itself an illegitimate undertaking. It all depends on whether or not the Old Testament has been correctly understood and applied, and this must be decided in every case for itself. We are here not yet concerned with whether or not Vs 24-27 represents the thought of Jesus, but with the question of their origin. I hope to be able to show that these Vs do not represent just an arbitrary collection of Old Testament texts but are the product of a well thought out theology. We must only try to read the Bible with the eyes of the early Christians and keep in mind the principles of contemporary Jewish exegesis.

The suggestion of Matthew that Daniel be read only makes explicit what is already implied by the use of the phrase "sacrilege of devastation." Someone has taken this advice, read, and thought to understand. In Dn 7 it is said that at the end of the fourth kingdom, which is the kingdom of Antiochos IV who had set up the sacrilege, there will come one like a son of man. Jesus, too, spoke of the coming of the Son of Man, and everything else follows from the belief, even if it is a mistaken belief, that Jesus applied Dn 7:13 to his second coming within a generation. The Son of Man thus comes to carry out the judgment of the great day of the Lord, as is implied in Dn 7:10 and 26, and the church knows already from the Old Testament what this day will be like. Indeed, there are a number of Old Testament passages in which the whole history of the church, from the coming of Christ to the end of the world, could be read. One such text is Joel 2-4, which we mention here because the passage about the signs in the heavens is cited in Acts 2:20.¹ After the trumpet call and the proclamation of the gospe

¹ For what follows, cf. C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 1952, pp. 62f.

in Zion (2:1, κηρύξατε), there follows a description of the day of the Lord and the judgment of Jerusalem (2:2-11), which ends with the darkening of sun, moon and stars.¹ Then there is another trumpet call, and the formation of the church (2:16),² followed by promises for the people of God (2:18-27). Joel 3, which must have been thought of as parallel to Chapter 2 and not subsequent to it, is the passage quoted in Acts, with the outpouring of the Spirit, the darkening of sun and moon, and the destruction of all of Jerusalem except for those "who call on the name of the Lord," those who have heard the gospel (εὐαγγελιζόμενοι) and been called by the Lord. There follows in Chapter 4 the final judgment of the nations, including Edom (4:19), described as a wine-press and a harvest (4:13), where again sun, moon, and stars are darkened (4:15). One can see why, on the basis of Joel 2-4, the darkening of sun, moon and stars should be mentioned just after the tribulation which befalls Jerusalem. By the early Rabbinic exegetical principle of *gezera shawa* other passages could also be introduced. There are two sections of Isaiah which describe a darkening of the heavenly bodies in connection with judgment on Rome (Babel, Edom): 13:1-14:23 and 34:1-17. It is very probable that anyone meditating on the judgment of the nations, and especially of Rome, which should follow the destruction of Jerusalem, whether starting from Joel or not, would also reread or recall these passages. The result is Mk 13:24f, which owes something to Is 13:10, something to Is 34:4,³ and perhaps even something to Joel 2:10, 4:15.⁴ The fact that the author, however, did not intend to quote is shown by the fact that none of the reminiscences are accurate, and furthermore, he has written four lines of poetry, a *parallelismus membrorum* where the first three parallel statements are summed up in the fourth. The

¹ Those who execute judgement on Jerusalem are described as "a great and mighty people whose like has never been seen from the beginning nor *will be* after then throughout all generations" (2:2b). This would facilitate the connection of the final tribulation with the oracle composed at the time of the Caligula crisis, which says that such a tribulation "never will be" again (Mk 13:19b).

² συναγάγετε λαόν, ἀγιάσατε ἐκκλησίαν, ἐκλέξασθε πρεσβυτέρους.

³ But not to the LXX, which did not have 4a (* in Origen). Vs 5 shows the context of the thought: "For my sword has drunk its fill in the heavens; behold, it descends for judgement upon Edom, upon the people I have doomed."

⁴ Where LXX reads φέγγος as in Mk, instead of φῶς as in Is 13:10. But this is doubtful.

author certainly had read Is 13:10 and 34:4, but when it came to writing these lines, he let them influence his language without actually citing either of them.

Vs 26, which is an interpretation of the saying of Jesus preserved in Mk 14:62, has been probably the point of departure for the whole passage. Daniel 7:13f has here clearly been understood to refer to the coming of the Son of Man from heaven to earth in the end times, an understanding which sets this passage apart from the rest of the New Testament, where Dn 7:13f is applied to Jesus' ascension rather than to his second coming.¹ Also the end of the verse comes from Daniel, for the δόξα with which the Son of Man comes is the יְקָרָא of Dn 7:14 and the δύναμις his שְׁלֹטָן.² Whether or not Dn 7:13f has been correctly understood, it is clear that the Old Testament is the sole source for the statements made here.

Vs. 27 again brings to mind several Old Testament passages without being an actual citation of any of them. The resemblance to the LXX of Zech 2:10 is only accidental, for the MT says just the opposite, Zech 2 is not otherwise quoted in the New Testament, and the use of the "four winds" to express universality is a commonplace. At the end of the verse, the author thought that a combination of the two common phrases "from the end of heaven to the end of heaven" (as in Dt 30:4) and "from the end of the earth to the end of the earth" (as in Dt 13:7) would express the superlative of universality. Most modern commentators, but also already Mt, disagree with him. More interesting than slight verbal parallels to isolated passages is the Old Testament source of the thought of this verse. Where is it said that the Son of Man can dispatch angels? Angels are mentioned in connection with him also in Mk 8:38, Mt 13:36, and 25:31, and it may very well be that the idea goes back to Jesus. But if so, he must have had some scriptural warrant for saying so. It could be assumed that the angels of Dan 7:10 were given to the Son of Man along with the kingdom, but where is this actual-

¹ See below, pp. 384-392.

² It is true that in the LXX δύναμις is usually the translation of חֵיל or צְבָא, but the ideas of "power" and "authority" are not so far apart. We have perhaps evidence that the early church translated the שְׁלֹטָן of Dn 7:14 with δύναμις in the late addition to the Lord's prayer, Mt 6:13b (cf. Did 8:2, 10:5): "for thine is the kingdom (βασίλεια = מַלְכוּת) and the power (δύναμις = שְׁלֹטָן) and the glory (δόξα = יְקָרָא) forever," exactly what is said of the Son of Man in Dn 7:14.

ly said? Doeve¹ suggests that it could be deduced by the principles of rabbinic exegesis from the MT of Zech 14:5, where it is said that "the Lord my God will come and all the holy ones with thee (עִמָּךְ)." Who is being addressed, if not the Son of Man? That Zech 14:5 was understood of the angels which will come with the Son of Man is shown by Mt 25:31, 1 Thes 3:13, Did 16:7f, and in Justin, 1 Apol 51, where Jeremiah (sic!) is quoted for the second coming: "Behold, as the Son of Man he comes in the clouds of heaven, and his angels with him." As for the gathering of the dispersed, it would be well to find a reference to this in a text which we know was important to the early Christians. This is true of the context of Zech 14:5, and it has the advantage of speaking of the gathering of the elect from the nations and not just from the Diaspora of Israel. Already in 9:9 we have the *testamonium* about the king on the ass; then follows "the blood of my covenant" (9:11) and the advent of the Lord with a trumpet call (9:14) to save the flock (9:16). After the mention of false prophets and the failure of the leaders of the people, these are punished (10:3, understood as the Zealots?). But from the flock will come the cornerstone (10:4), and the Lord will gather the dispersed: "I will signal for them and gather them in, for I have redeemed them... Though I scattered them among the nations, yet in far countries they shall remember me" (10:8b). In Chapter 12 we find the siege of Jerusalem (12:2-3), the pouring out of the Holy Spirit (12:10, cf 13:1), and the *testamonium* "they shall look on him whom they have pierced." In 13:7 we find the Vs which shows of whom the early church interpreted the pierced one and the flock: "Strike the shepherd and the sheep will be scattered." There follows a destruction of two-thirds of Israel, while one-third will be tested (13:9, cf 1 Pet 1:7) and saved. We come finally to Chapter 14, where after the fall of Jerusalem (14:2) as we have seen, the Lord will come with his angels (14:5), living water will flow from Jerusalem (14:8), and it is seen that among those gathered in will be the survivors of the nations (14:16).

If our analysis of these Vs 24-27 has been along the right lines, then it tells us something about the form-critical history of this section. If it is true that Vs 26 is based on a misinterpretation of Jesus' exegesis of Dan 7, then it is clear that these words cannot be sayings of Jesus. Indeed, it is questionable that they ever intended

¹ J. W. Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*, 1953.

to be so before being put in their present setting in Mark. They represent rather a piece of Christian theology, based squarely on scripture, but also on an interpretation of Dan 7:13 which was thought to have come from Jesus. They deal further with a subject which was of the utmost importance to the early church, given the presuppositions of the author. To provide instruction and consolation for Christians faced with the early return of their Lord, he has searched the scriptures in the light of this situation and has expressed what he found there in memorable language.

Mark 13:28-30

28 From the fig-tree learn the parable: when you see its branch already become soft and it puts forth leaves, you know that the summer is near.

29 *Thus* you too, when you see this happening, know that it is near, at the gate.

30 (*For* the Lord says:) Amen, I say to you, this generation will not pass away before all these things happen.

The parable of the fig-tree is generally considered to be a genuine saying of Jesus,¹ but Knox rightly calls it in its present position "grotesque."² The only way one can interpret the parable in its context is to make ταῦτα refer back to the "signs" of Vs 5-23 and to supply as the subject of ἐγγύς ἐστίη the returning Son of Man of Vs 24-27. But quite aside from the fact that an understanding of Vs 5-23 as signs destined to give certainty to the coming parousia is questionable, it is impossible just to skip over Vs 24-27 in this fashion. Jeremias³ is, therefore, typical of most modern scholars when he seeks to interpret the parable independently of its context, whereby the point of comparison is then: the budding fig-tree = the signs of Jesus' ministry. He rightly points to the fact that the return of life to the fig-tree in the spring cannot be a sign of the suffering before the end, but rather of the anticipations in Jesus' life of the time of salvation. When Jeremias goes on to interpret the coming summer of the Messiah standing before the door, however, he lets himself after all be influenced by the context of Mk 13. The signs of Jesus' ministry in other passages, his answer to John

¹ Only E. Schwartz, "Der verfluchte Feigenbaum," *ZNW* 5 (1904), pp. 80-84, and Wellhausen, *Mk*, p. 106, seek to connect it with the fig tree of Mk 11:12-14 and interpret it as originating in the early church.

² *Sources*, p. 107.

³ *Die Gleichnisse Jesu*, 1956⁴, p. 102.

the Baptist, Mt 11:4ff, the casting out of demons, Mk 3:27, Lk 11:20, the sign of Jonah with something greater than Jonah or Solomon, Lk 11:29ff, Mt 12:39ff, etc., all point not to the Messiah who is soon coming but to him who is already here. Jeremias was thrown off the right track by the application Vs 29, and we must consider whether or not this Vs was part of the original parable. If we do not consider the context, we notice that: either ταῦτα has no antecedent and ἐγγύς ἐστιν no subject, or ταῦτα refers to the tender twig and budding leaves, and it is the summer which is near the gates. In the first case we must postulate a lost context, but what? And why was the reference kept while the context was lost? And in the second case, we must admit that Vs 29 only repeats the thought of Vs 28 exactly and is therefore superfluous. Vs 28 alone, however, can stand very well as a complete parable, even if it has undergone a few minor changes by being set in the second person in accordance with its use here.¹ Luke has given this parable in spite of Mk its natural and correct application: when you see the signs of my ministry, know that the kingdom is near, a saying closely parallel to Lk 11:20. We can perhaps interpret the parable a bit further without fear of falling into allegory: what aspect of the kingdom does Jesus mean when he speaks of the θέρος?² It is possible that he is repeating the word-play of Am 8:2 between קָץ (= θέρος) and קָץ (= τέλος), which would, however, assume that this saying was spoken in Hebrew.³ Even if this pun was not intended, however, the symbol of the harvest⁴ in the New Testament is often used for the end in its aspect of judgment, Mt 13:39 "the harvest is the close of the age," cf. Mk 4:29, Mt 3:12, 13:30, Rev

¹ Lohmeyer, *Mk*, p. 280, suggests that the opening may have read: ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ δένδρῳ (but surely συκῇ would be better?), and already the MSS evidence (B³DΘal) should tell us that γινώσκεται was the original reading, γινώσκετε being imported from Vs 29.

² Is it possible that precisely this parable has been chosen because the understanding of "summer" here presupposed provides a contrast to the "winter" of the tribulation, Vs 18?

³ The Aramaic אַרְבָּעָה and אַרְבָּעָה do not permit this word play. It is of course not only possible but even likely that Jesus spoke Hebrew, Cf. T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, 1931. But would he have told a parable in this language?

⁴ Should we so translate? Both θέρος and אַרְבָּעָה can have this meaning of harvest, i.e. the product of harvesting, not the act (= θερισμός, קציר). But even if we translate "summer", it is summer in its aspect of harvest-time, not heat or the like, which is envisaged.

14:15. It seems to me to express the sense of the parable better, however, if we think of the harvest as the Christian mission, as in Mt 9:37, Joh 4:35-38. The sense would then be: you see from my healings and casting out of demons that the scriptures which speak of the coming Kingdom of God are being fulfilled; so too those which speak of the gathering of the dispersed of Israel and the nations will also soon be fulfilled. If we admit such an interpretation, then there is a good connection to the preceding section.

In Vs 5-8, 21-23 we saw that the pattern was exhortation—γάρ—ground in an accepted dogma, whether a word of Jesus or the Old Testament. Here the pattern is reversed: saying of Jesus (parable)—application and exhortation, whereby the second person of exhortation has influenced the parable too. The application begins with οὕτως, as in Mt 13:40, 49, 18:14, 35, Lk 12:21, 20:16, etc. and continues with the imperative, as in Mk 4:9, 23, Mt 25:13, Lk 10:37, verses which are in every case secondary.¹ If Vs 29 stems from the hand who added the genuine parable Vs 28 after Vs 24-27, then many things can be explained. The subject of ἐγγύς ἐστιν will be the θέρος, interpreted as the gathering of the elect, which in context is identical with the coming of the Son of Man. The argument that ἐπὶ θύραις must imply a personal subject, as in James 5:9, is not a valid one, for in the only other use of the phrase to imply temporal nearness, Acts 5:9, the subject is impersonal, πόδες.² Nevertheless, the interpretation "he is near" for "it is near" is a very natural one in view of Vs 26 beside 27. The author has changed the meaning of the parable insofar as the budding tree now stands for the great tribulation which heralds Christ's coming—the ταῦτα is very awkward, but if this is what he wanted to say, it could hardly have been helped. Perhaps we now also have an explanation for the καὶ ὑμεῖς, which implies a contrast to another group. In analogy to Vs 37, it is emphasized here that not only the disciples, the first hearers of the parable, but also the contemporary Christians are meant.

Vs 30 has also been made part of the application, as the retrospective πάντα ταῦτα shows.³ But just because the application to the

¹ Cf. Jeremias, *Gleichnisse*, esp. pp. 93f.

² Rev 3:20 is not analogous, for there Christ is not *near* but *at* the door.

³ Mt has made this clearer by adding πάντα to the preceding verse. It is argued by W. Michaelis, *Der Herr verzieht nicht die Verheissung*, 1942, pp. 30f., and others that Vs 30 refers thereby only to the "signs" of 5-23 and not to the coming of the Son of Man, which is very unlikely and in any

parable is secondary, the saying itself does not have to be an invention of the church. Very often a parable is secondarily closed with a general application which is a free-floating genuine saying of Jesus—indeed the saying must be genuine to fulfil its purpose of giving dominical authority to a certain interpretation. We even find a saying beginning with “(Amen), I say to you” used in this manner Mt 5:26, 21:31, cf. Lk 14:24, 15:7, 10, 18:14. Already the formula “Amen, I say to you” is a sign of genuineness,¹ but in this case we have an even greater confirmation in the parallels Mk 9:1, Mt 10:23. In all three cases we have Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν (ᾗτι) . . . οὐ μὴ all of this generation will have died ἕως ἄν (or μέχρις οὗ) the Son of Man (Mt) or the Kingdom of God (Mk, Lk) comes. In view of these close parallels, we must assume that Vs 30 is a parallel tradition of the same saying, and that it referred originally not to the preliminaries πάντα ταῦτα but to the coming itself. A genuine word of Jesus has been modified by its use in the interpretation of a parable to the situation of Mk 13. A difficulty arises only in the fact that this saying is brought in the first person, in a context which we have seen to be that of eschatological exhortation to the church. If some such phrase as λέγει γὰρ² ὁ κύριος had once stood here, Mk would certainly have deleted it from his gospel. Vs 31-32, also words of Jesus, would then have been added later, at a time when the whole of Vs 5-30 was thought of as having been spoken by Jesus. In any case, this one saying of Jesus following the parable has attracted two more.

Mark 13:31,32

31 Heaven and earth will pass away, but my words will not pass away.

32 Concerning that day or that hour no one knows, neither the angels in heaven nor the Son, but only the Father.

Few conclusions can be drawn from the form of these two sayings about the line of their transmission or when they entered the tradition of Mk 13. In view of the parallels in Mt 5:18, Lk 16:17, the saying in Vs 31 is surely genuine. The same is true of Vs 32, at least

case may not be used apologetically, for the parable certainly means that the harvest will follow very soon.

¹ Cf. J. Jeremias, “Kennzeichen der ipsissima vox Jesu,” *Synoptische Studien*, 1954, pp. 86ff.

² Cf. the use of γὰρ in the similar Mt 10:23; Lk 14:24.

in some form¹ (Cf. Acts 1:7). There is no necessary contradiction between Vs 32 and 30, as the parables on watchfulness presuppose both that there is something to watch for, and that one must *watch*, not knowing exactly when. Nevertheless, there is a difference between such a presupposition and writing both sayings side by side, and it cannot be denied that Vs 32 seems to be a gentle polemic against a possible misunderstanding of Vs 30. It is, therefore, probable that these sayings were not always joined to Vs 30 and the parable of the fig-tree. Even if they were added after Vs 5-27 were understood as being spoken by Jesus, nevertheless they are admirably suited to the eschatological exhortation of the chapter. Vs 31 assures the hearers of the authority of Jesus for the prediction of an early end, but even more of the fact that he will endure beyond the end for their salvation.² Vs 32 is also in accord with the chief emphasis of the chapter in discouraging apocalyptic fever, cf. Vs 7, 8b, 13b.

Mark 13:33-37

33 Take heed, watch and pray!

For you do not know when the time is. 34 Like a man gone abroad, having left his house and given his servants authority to each his own work, and he commanded the doorkeeper to watch.

35 Watch therefore,

for you do not know when the lord of the house comes, whether at evening or at midnight or at cockcrow or at dawn. 36 Lest when he come suddenly he find you sleeping.

37 What I say to you I say to all: watch!

The chapter ends with a section of pure *parenesis*, again in the form: exhortation-γάρ-ground, which is very important for our investigation. Almost every phrase can be paralleled on the one hand in the language of the New Testament epistles, but on the

¹ For the absolute use of "the Son" here, cf. O. Cullmann, *Christologie des Neuen Testaments*, 1957, p. 295. One argument which is often given for the genuineness of this saying is not however valid. Jerome said of it: "gaudet Arius et Eunomius quasi ignorantia magistris" (quoted in Klostermann, *Mk.*, p. 138), but we have no evidence that this passage was an embarrassment before the Arian controversy. Irenaeus quotes it *adv. Haer.* V, 28, 6 against the gnostics to prove the ignorance of the Son, as does Tertullian *adv. Prax.* 26 (cf. *de anima* 33).

² This explanation according to the function of the saying is surely better than that of a mechanical Stichwort association ad vocem *παρέρχομαι*, as is proposed by Klostermann, *Mk.*, p. 138 and Taylor, *Mk.*, p. 519.

other hand also by the parables of watchfulness. It is the parables which are most important in a discussion of origins, for it seems that both the exhortations of the epistles and this section of Mark echo the language of parables without being such themselves. Jeremias would like to find traces of a parable of the doorkeeper here and in Lk 12:35-38, but he must admit that it is "besonders stark zersagt."¹ It may be that he is right, but we have not the fuller form of this parable to be able to make a comparison. Jeremias admits that Vs 33 and 37 are "Rahmungsverse" and that the second person in Vs 35-36 is secondary. But he must also admit that the words "It is like a man going on a journey" come from the parable of the talents (Mt 25:14) and that "he put his servants in charge" comes from the parable of the faithful and wise servant (Mt 24:45). This means that all that is left of the supposed original parable are the words: "and commands his doorkeeper to be on the watch," precisely the trait that is lacking in the Lucan parallel!² It is then more likely that we have here not a separate parable, transmitted as a saying of Jesus, but an example of the parenetic of the church which is itself derived from the language of the parables. Quite aside from the close parallels in the secondary applications in Mt 24:42 and 25:13, the statement "for you do not know when the time is" could stand as the conclusion of any of the watchfulness parables. Here the function of the statement is to draw the moral of the saying of Jesus in Vs 32: Watch, for no one knows when the day and the hour will be, not even the Son.³ The interpretation of Vs 34 as a self-contained parable is difficult, and it is more probable that we have in a short metaphor the general situation of watchfulness sketched, in language which reminds of two, or perhaps three full parables. Already Vs 35 leaves the parable form for a direct exhortation again. 35a is little more than a repetition of Vs 33. A comparison with Lk 12:37 shows that the κύριος τῆς οἰκίας may be the house-master of a parable, but Lohmeyer's suggestion of the "Lord of the church" is not impossible; parable and application

¹ *Gleichnisse*, p. 45.

² Is it possible that the doorkeeper has been added because ἐπὶ θύραις in Vs 29 has been interpreted of the returning Lord and the correlate of the Lord standing at the door is a doorkeeper who will watch to open?

³ But also: watch, for he will come in your lifetime, cf. Vs 29, 30. "Watch and pray" is read by the majority of MSS (all but BDit). Just as likely as the fact that this verse has been assimilated to Mk 14:38 is that Mark is there deliberately imitating this passage.

have been so mixed that one cannot say for sure. 35b uses the Roman division of the night into four watches and is thus later than Lk 12:38 with the Jewish three divisions. Vs 36 is true both of the situation of the 10 virgins (Mt 25:5f) and of the exhortation of the early church.

The conclusion, "what I say to you I say to all," is very important for the question of the origin of the whole chapter, for it betrays a knowledge of the fact that the content of the discourse is not consonant with its having been spoken by Jesus to only four disciples. It is perhaps an indication that the discourse was not originally transmitted as words of Jesus, and that this Vs was, therefore, added by Mk when he incorporated the chapter into his gospel.

2. FORM AND FUNCTION OF MARK 13

It is generally agreed that Mark 13 does not represent a verbatim account of what Jesus may have said to his disciples on the Mount of Olives during Wednesday afternoon of Passion Week. This chapter is unique in the gospel of Mark as the only long speech, as distinguished from the collection of sayings in Chapter 4, put into the mouth of Jesus. This does not mean that Jesus could not have spoken to his disciples about such subjects at that time or that no word here can be authentic, but the fact remains that we have to do with a composition of the church, which must be considered first as such. No one would maintain that Mark has simply invented everything out of his own head, nor, in view of the close connections between many verses, does it seem that he has been the first to unite sayings floating separately in the oral tradition. The chapter has a pre-history, and it is this which we must now investigate.

It is surprising that we should find ourselves here on practically virgin ground. Bultmann has taken over the little apocalypse theory, which he thinks excuses him from any investigation of an oral tradition, and K. L. Schmidt and Dibelius have no discussion of the body of Mk 13 at all. This attitude can be justified only if it is true that Mark has taken over a written document which is extraneous to the Christian tradition. A study of our chapter would then properly belong in the framework of a discussion of late Jewish apocalyptic literature. It would beg the question completely, however, to begin with Colani's assumption that apocalyptic and thus much of Mark 13 is foreign to the early Christian Church. Since

Mark is a Christian writing, it would seem much more fruitful to attempt to understand him against a Christian background, to seek to conclude from the form of the chapter as we have it something of the function the different elements of the tradition may have had in the life of the church. It is not enough just to atomize the chapter into a series of disconnected verses, "aus verschiedenen Quellen," as Lohmeyer constantly says. The problem is to trace the history of the joining of these themes.

The overall literary form of Mark 13 is that of a farewell discourse, to be developed more fruitfully in John 14-17 and Luke 22:21-38, in which a great man gives instructions to his followers just before his death.¹ From such Old Testament origins as Gen 49, Jos 23, 1 Sam 12, Dt as a whole and especially Chapter 33, the form developed into its fullest extent in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. In the New Testament we find it also in Acts 20:17ff, 1 and 2 Tim, and 2 Peter. It is in the nature of a farewell discourse to unite predictions of the future with directions for the conduct of the disciples for the time when their master will be no longer with them, and this is one of the primary characteristics of Mark 13. What is, however, essential for a farewell discourse is that it take place just before the death of the beloved master, and this is the case with Mark 13 only by virtue of its position in the gospel. But if it is true, as we have surmised, that Mark is not alone responsible for the composition of this chapter, but that he took it over more or less in its present form, then we must investigate only the content. Here we find no indication at all of the situation of a farewell discourse, for it has long puzzled commentators that Jesus predicts everything but his own immanent death.²

If we seek to determine the setting for apocalyptic teaching in the life of Jesus aside from our chapter, the early church gives but one answer: in the mouth of the risen Christ. The widespread conviction of the early Church³ that Jesus gave special instructions to his disciples after his resurrection is based partly on such passages as Acts 1:2 ἐντειλάμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις and perhaps Mt 28:20 ὅσα

¹ Cf. J. Munck, "Discours d'adieu dans le Nouveau Testament et dans la littérature biblique," *Aux Sources de la Tradition Chrétienne*, 1950, pp. 155-170; E. Stauffer, *New Testament Theology*, 1963⁵, pp. 344ff.

² Busch, *synopt. Eschatologie*, p. 44, who calls Mk 13 an "Abschiedsrede" overlooks this fact.

³ Justin, 1 *Apol* 50, 67; *Dial* 53, 106; Origen, *cont. Cels.* 5:58; Tertullian, *Apol* 21; Cyprian, *quod idola* 14, etc.

ἐντελείμην ὑμῖν. From other passages we learn something about the content of this instruction. "I have yet many things to say to you, but you cannot bear them now. When the Spirit of truth comes, he will guide you into all the truth" (John 16:12f). Why can the disciples not bear to hear these many things? Is it because they have not yet the assurance that Jesus has risen from the dead, which will comfort them in the coming troubles? Peter says in Acts 10:42: "And he (scil. the risen Christ, cf. verses 40f) commanded us to preach to the people, and to testify that he is the one ordained by God to be the judge of the living and the dead." According to this statement, it was from the risen Christ that the disciples heard about the second coming. Is this not the only situation in which Christ can speak of his coming again? The disciples did not even understand the necessity of his death; can they then have been given instructions about a second coming before Christ's death and resurrection? The commandment to preach to the Gentiles aside from Mark 13:10 is always in the New Testament given by the risen Christ (Mt 28:19, Mk 16:15, Lk 24:47, Jn 20:22, Gal 1:16). In Lk 24:45 (cf. verses 27, 32, 44-47), "Then he opened their minds to understand the scriptures," we see that the risen Christ was thought to be a source of Christian midrash, and even if this was already true of the incarnated Christ, the use made of the Old Testament in Mark 13 takes on a new light. The closest parallel in the New Testament to the type of material contained in Mark 13 is undoubtedly the book of Revelation, which is a revelation of the risen Christ, "The revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave him to show his servants what must soon take place" (1:1, cf. 1:12f). If we could think of Mark 13:5-37 being spoken by the risen Christ, then many of its characteristics could be explained, especially the fact that there is no mention of the death of Christ, which is simply presupposed. If we maintain that this chapter once circulated as such, it is not just because of the general kind of material it contains, but also because of some very close parallels.

Martin Dibelius in his analysis of the literary forms of early Christianity¹ spoke of "Evangelien-Offenbarungen," in which the risen Lord, in answer to a question of one of the disciples, speaks of the future of the world. He then says later of Mark 13, "So bildet diese Apokalypse eine Art Vorläufer zu den Evangelien-Offen-

¹ *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur*, 1926, Bd. I, p. 64.

barungen" and "Dieser synoptischen Apokalypse hat man nach Rahmen und Art wohl die zwei bis drei Menschenalter später entstandene Petrus-Apokalypse an die Seite zu stellen."¹ If Dibelius does not draw the logical conclusion from these observations, it is only because he is blinded by the little apocalypse theory. It is worthwhile to quote the beginning of the Apocalypse of Peter which he mentions as a close parallel:²

1. And when the Lord was seated upon the Mount of Olives, his disciples came unto him (Mt 24:3). And we besought and entreated him severally (= κατ' ἰδίαν?) and prayed him, saying unto him: Declare unto us what are the signs of thy coming and of the end of the world (24:3), that we may perceive and mark the time of thy coming and instruct them that come after us. . . . And our Lord answered us, saying: Take heed that no man deceive you (24:4), and that ye be not doubters and serve other gods. Many shall come in my name, saying: I am the Christ (24:5). Believe them not (24:23), neither draw men unto them. For the coming of the Son of God shall not be plain; but as the lightning that shineth from the east unto the west (24:27), so will I come upon the clouds of heaven (24:30) with a great host in my majesty. . . . 2. And ye, take ye the likeness thereof from the fig tree; as soon as the shoot thereof is come forth and the twigs grow, the end of the world shall come (24:32-33).

This short passage is enough to show that the Apocalypse of Peter is dependent on the synoptic apocalypse, in the form in which we find it in Matthew, but he seems to have known a tradition which puts it in the mouth of the risen Christ on the Mount of Olives.³ The Apocalypse of Peter is not alone thereby. The *Epistola Apostolorum*⁴ takes the form of a dialogue with the risen Christ, just before his ascension. The syriac *Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi* is also such a dialogue, which contains, along with church canons, the question of Peter and John,—“Domini, dic nobis signa

¹ Ibid., p. 94.

² Translated by M. R. James, *The apocryphal New Testament*, p. 510f; Cf. Hennecke-Schneemelcher, Bd. I, p. 472f.

³ That the Apocalypse of Peter is a discourse of the risen Christ, and that it is the ascension which is described in terms of the transfiguration, cf. A. von Harnack, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, IX, 2, 1893, p. 50.

⁴ C. Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach der Auferstehung*, 1919; Hennecke-Schneemelcher, Bd. I, pp. 127ff. Because the introduction to the Coptic text seems to imitate Mt 28, Schmidt speaks of an “apokalyptischen Rede Jesu an seine Jünger in Galiläa,” but the ascension at the end would indicate rather the Mount of Olives.

finis (mundi),”¹ which is followed by instructions of Jesus based on Mark 13. The gnostic Pistis Sophia consists of teachings of Jesus to his disciples on the Mount of Olives just before the ascension, and this situation is in general popular among the gnostics.² It is also probable that the so-called Gospel according to the Egyptians, and even more the newly found Gospel of Thomas, which begins: “These are the secret words which Jesus the living one (ὁ ζῶν = the resurrected Christ) spoke . . .”, are collections of sayings of the risen Christ.³ Finally, we even have evidence for the risen Christ predicting the fall of Jerusalem. The ending of Mark, according to W (the Freer Logion) contains the words: “(Satan has fallen) but other terrible things are near; also for those who sinned in that I was delivered unto death, in order that they return to the truth and sin no more. . .” Lactantius, in the *Divine Institutes*, IV, 21, says of the risen Christ:

But he also opened to them all things which were about to happen, which Peter and Paul preached at Rome; and this preaching being written for the sake of remembrance became permanent, in which they both declared other wonderful things, and also said that it was about to come to pass, that after a short time God would send against them a king who would subdue the Jews, and level their cities to the ground, and besiege the people themselves, worn out with hunger and thirst. Then it should come to pass that they should feed on the bodies of their own children, and consume one another. Lastly that they should be taken captive, and come into the hands of their enemies, and should see their wives most cruelly harassed before their eyes, their virgins ravished and polluted, their sons torn in pieces, their little ones dashed to the ground; and lastly, everything laid waste with fire and sword, the captives banished forever from their own lands, because they had exalted over the well-beloved and most approved Son of God.⁴

Lactantius speaks of a writing in Rome. Could it be that he has seen an expanded form of the original of Mark 13?

¹ Ed. I. E. Rahmani, *Moguntiae*, 1899, p. 7.

² Pistis Sophia, c. 2 (Hennecke-Schneemelcher, I, p. 177); cf. further the Gospel of Bartholomew IV, 1 (p. 366), the Gospel of Mary (p. 251f), the Apocryphon of John (p. 235), the Sophia Jesu Christi, where the Mount of Olives is interestingly located in Galilee (p. 171), the Acts of John 97-102 (Hennecke-Schneemelcher, II, pp. 157ff), the Apocalypse of Paul (II, p. 566).

³ Cf. B. Gärtner, *The Theology of the Gospel according to Thomas*, 1961, pp. 98, 101ff.

⁴ This statement has been quoted at length (from the translation of Fletcher in the ANF) as an example of what a true vaticinium ex eventu of the fall of Jerusalem looks like, as opposed to Lk 21:20ff.

Some of these parallels might seem too remote to indicate that the immediate source of Mark 13 ever circulated as an independent document. Much more important, however, is Acts 1:6-12, which could be understood as a summary of a tradition parallel to Mark 13, as instructions of the risen Christ on the Mount of Olives. There the disciples ask a question very similar to that of Mark 13:4, and receive as an answer: "It is not for you to know times or seasons which the father has fixed by his own authority," a parallel to Mark 13:32. There then follows the promise of the Spirit¹ and the command to preach the gospel, all that was necessary for the purpose of the writer of Acts, but no more. But that Acts knows that the post-resurrection instruction was fuller than what is here quoted, is shown by Vs 2: ἐντεταλμένοις.

The idea that Mk 13:5-37 was originally conceived to be a discourse of the risen Christ has apparently been only suggested by A. Loisy and Strather Hunt.² Loisy says:³ "Si Marc fait dire la prophétie sur le mont des Oliviers, c'est que sa source immédiate la présentait comme une instruction du Christ montant au ciel, c'est-à-dire exactement dans les conditions où l'Apocalypse de Pierre présente une révélation analogue." If we can accept this and that Mark knew the original setting, then many elements in Mk 13:3-4 can be explained. The fact that the discourse takes place on the Mount of Olives is then full of meaning. κατ' ἰδίαν is a standard phrase in such situations, cf. Irenaus, adv. Haer. I, 25, 5. As for the disciples who ask, we can compare Clemens Alex.,⁴ "After the Resurrection the Lord gave the tradition of knowledge to James the Just and John and Peter, these gave it to the other apostles, etc." Because "words of the Lord" could also be considered words of Jesus, Mark has inserted a discourse of the risen Christ into his gospel, making it refer to the destruction of the temple by connecting it with the saying in Vs 2, but in composing the introduction, preserving enough of the original situation that we can still see

¹ Which also seems to have belonged to a post-resurrection context; cf. Mt 28:20; Lk 24:49; Mk 16:17f; Jn 20:22.

² B. P. W. Strather Hunt, *Primitive Gospel Sources*.

³ *Les Origines du Nouveau Testament*, 1936, p. 320, cf. p. 56, 104. It is of course in connection with his idea of the transition of the primitive "catéchèse eschatologique" into the "catéchèse évangélique."

⁴ In Eusebius, *H.E.*, II, 1, 4. Why Andrew is also named as a middleman in Mark we cannot say, any more than we can say why he is named along with John and Peter as an interrogator in the *Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi*, ed. Rahmani, p. 147.

his source. But what is the origin of this discourse of Christ on the Mount of Olives?

The traditional solution to the problem of Mark 13 is to postulate a Jewish apocalypse with Christian additions. It is, of course, even more possible for this to have been the case if we are dealing with instructions of the risen Christ than if the material always belonged to the gospel tradition. The difficulty comes only in deciding which verses would have originally belonged to this Jewish apocalypse. In his extensive review of the little apocalypse theory, Beasley-Murray¹ has shown that every verse has at one time or another been included in such an apocalyptic source, and every verse has been omitted from it. Accordingly, this attempt to find a connected Jewish apocalypse has today been largely abandoned. The so-called "Christian additions" can be found in the most varied forms throughout the whole chapter. There is simply no criterion of why one way of taking a selection of verses from this chapter and trying to fit them into a connected source should be better than another. Is it then possible to speak of "Jewish apocalyptic elements" which have been incorporated? The procedure of removing all sayings which refer to some specific characteristic of Christianity and saying that the remainder must be Jewish is not one to be scientifically recommended. Anyone proceeding in such a way would reflect his own dislike of apocalyptic and prejudice against Judaism, and he would also, of course, beg the whole question. A more objective approach would seek the origins of the chapter among transmitters of the Christian tradition, without writing off any portion because of modern antipathies toward the content.

A further question is whether or not Vs 5-37 as they stand, without trying to extract a special source, could be called an apocalypse. Lohmeyer, who thinks they can be so called, was nevertheless forced to remark:² "Am auffälligsten ist, dass das Thema des Welt- und Völkergerichts, mit der Gestalt des Menschensohn seit Dan 7 verbunden, hier völlig fehlt." But this is not all that is lacking. The Apostolic Constitutions, VII, 31f, is interesting in this respect, as showing what belongs to a proper Christian apocalypse.

Be watchful for your life. Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning, and be ye like unto men who wait for their Lord,

¹ *Jesus and the Future*, pp. 33ff.

² *Mk*, p. 285.

when He will come, at even, or in the morning, or at cock-crowing, or at midnight. For at what hour they think not, the Lord will come; and if they open to Him, blessed are those servants, because they were found watching. For He will gird Himself, and will make them to sit down to meat, and will come forth and serve them. Watch, therefore, and pray, that ye do not sleep unto death. For your former deeds will not profit you, if at the last part of your life you go astray from the true faith. For in the last days false prophets shall be multiplied, and such as corrupt the word; and the sheep shall be changed into wolves, and love into hatred; for through the abounding of iniquity the love of many shall wax cold. For men shall hate, and persecute, and betray one another. And then shall appear the deceiver of the world, the prince of lies, whom the Lord Jesus shall destroy with the spirit of His mouth, who takes away the wicked with His lips; and many shall be offended at Him. But they that endure to the end, the same shall be saved. And then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven; and afterwards shall be the voice of a trumpet by the archangel; and in that interval shall be the revival of those that were asleep. And then shall the Lord come, and all His saints with Him, with a great concussion above the clouds, with the angels of His power, in the throne of His kingdom, to condemn the devil, the deceiver of the world, and to render to every one according to his deeds. Then shall the wicked go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous shall go into life eternal, to inherit those things which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor have entered into the heart of man, such things as God hath prepared for them that love Him; and they shall rejoice in the kingdom of God, which is in Christ Jesus.

This section is based, of course, on Didache 16, but the additions are interesting as coming almost all from the New Testament. They are all part of the early Christian expectations, but where in Mark 13 do we hear of the growing lawlessness and apostasy, of the destruction of Anti-Christ, the resurrection of the dead, the last judgment, the punishment of the wicked, and the bliss of the elected? When all these elements are lacking, can we still speak of an apocalypse?

The most recent attempt to find a systematic apocalyptic program in our chapter is that made by G. Harder.¹ His exegesis is ingenious, but much too forced at a number of points. Thus, after the Anti-Christ is seen standing in the temple, the Christians should flee for their lives, at the same time that the followers of Anti-Christ are streaming into Jerusalem. This will be a time of great

¹ "Das eschatologische Geschichtsbild der sogenannten kleinen Apokalypse Markus 13," *Theologia Viatorum*, 1952, pp. 71ff.

suffering for those fleeing, for Anti-Christ will try to stop their flight into the desert, just as Pharaoh tried to stop the Israelites and the dragon tried to stop the woman in Rev 12. The purpose of this flight is the separation of the forces of good and evil, so that the latter can be concentrated in one place and be destroyed. According to Harder, the destruction of the forces of Anti-Christ by a river of fire coming down from heaven upon Jerusalem, and the imprisonment of Anti-Christ in Gehinnom must have once stood between Vs 20 and 24, instead of the present Vs 21-23.¹ Then Christ will appear in the heaven directly over the destroyed Jerusalem and send out his angels to gather his elect back to the holy city. Then from Zion, the highest point of the earth,² they will be translated to the highest point of heaven, to the place of the blessed. It is possible, of course, to give a number of parallels from late Jewish apocalyptic to support every one of these points, and especially those to Revelation are impressive, but all this is simply not in the text of Mark 13.

Even if we do not have to do with a complete apocalypse, have we at least here the apocalyptic type, in the sense that the chapter describes a succession of coming apocalyptic events, even if the program is not complete? Kümmel³ has laid great stress on the number of temporal expressions: not yet (Vs 7), beginning (8), first (10), then (14), and then (21), after (24), and then (26), and then (27). This list is quite impressive when seen out of its context, but it is not at all true to the context of the chapter. We find only two periods of time envisaged, the present (Vs 5-13) and the near future (Vs 14-27). Some of the expressions Kümmel finds important only say that the present is not the end ("not yet," "first"), but only the "beginning" of the woes. The rest refer to the future in contrast to the present—"then" = "in those days" (Vs 17, 19, 20, 24). At only one place is a chronological succession indicated, when it is said that the second coming will be "after" that tribulation. Marxsen⁴ would also divide the chapter into Vs 5-13 which describe

¹ Vs 21-23 will then have been added after A.D. 70 as part of the delay of the destruction of Anti-Christ, for the fight between truth and falsehood must be carried out further.

² ἀπ' ὀρέων γῆς. This strange exegesis is to be found already in Lohmeyer, *Mk*, p. 279, and has been adopted but the locale changed to Galilee in Marxsen, *Mk*, p. 126.

³ *Promise and Fulfillment*, p. 97.

⁴ *Mk*, p. 121.

the situation of the present, and Vs 14ff. which concern events which for Mark were still in the future. It is a relapse into older categories when Conzelmann¹ prefers the opposition between historical (Vs 5-23) and apocalyptic (Vs 24-27), which he even calls the "Schlüssel für die Gliederung der Darstellung."² It is, however, doubtful whether such a distinction would have been understood by Mark, or that he would separate the coming supernatural "kosmische Katastrophe" from the historical tribulation of the destruction of the temple. The real division is, as Marxsen maintains, only that between present and future. It is, therefore, very misleading to speak of an apocalyptic program, which must be contrasted to an eschatology of suddenness as in Lk 17.³

It is also misleading to speak of signs, as does the question in Mk 13:4.⁴ If an early Christian had wanted to know the approximate date of the parousia, would he have gotten any help from our chapter, aside from the universal New Testament feeling that it would be soon? He could learn that it would occur after the great tribulation, but so immediately afterwards that the tribulation could not be called a sign, but rather a part of the end itself, and too late to help him. It is not said that after the beginning of the tribulation there will be $3\frac{1}{2}$ times, or 2,300 evening-mornings, or 1,335 days, or anything of the kind. And there is absolutely no indication as to when this great tribulation will begin, except that it is "not yet" and that the author obviously thinks that it will be soon. In short, there is nothing in this chapter to eliminate the need for watching, which implies that the expected event will be in the lifetime of those watching, but sudden and at an unexpected time. Wellhausen⁵ thought that Mk 13:32 was intolerable in an apocalypse, in that it eliminates all possibility of fixing the date of a program, and he is probably right. But there is no contradiction between this verse and the rest of Mark 13. "In the thirteenth chapter of Mark there is no indication of any special revelation, no mystery in the language (except in Vs 14), none of the characteristic apparatus of the vision, nothing even to suggest knowledge

¹ "Geschichte und Eschaton nach Mc 13," *ZNW* 50 (1959), pp. 210-221.

² *ibid.*, p. 215. Cf. the distinction made by C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, 1936², pp. 51f, between "historical" and "supernatural."

³ T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, 1931, drives this distinction rather far and seeks thereby to discredit Mk 13 in favor of Q.

⁴ Note that in Mk 13:22 it is the false Messiah who gives signs.

⁵ *Das Evangelium Marci*, ad loc.

received from heaven for the purpose in hand. Whatever may be thought of the material of our chapter, or conjectured as to its composition, there is nothing in any part of it that can justify the use of the term 'apocalyptic'."¹

F. Busch² has come much closer to an understanding of our chapter when he calls it an explication of Mk 8:34, a "Mahnrede zur ὑπομονή im θλιψις." As W. G. Kümmel³ has put it, the function of the chapter as a whole is to give "eschatological promise, not apocalyptic instruction." This understanding of the general framework of Mark 13 in terms of the eschatological exhortation of the church rather than as the incorporation of a foreign apocalyptic "Flugblatt" has today become more common. For example, C. H. Dodd now says: "I certainly agree with recent critics who reject the idea that Mk 13 is a Jewish apocalypse taken over with certain Christian additions. For the most part I do not think that it is an apocalypse at all. It is a Mahnrede in apocalyptic terms, and I think it highly composit."⁴ Cf. further E. Lohmeyer:⁵ "Sie (viz. die Rede Mk 13) ist nicht nur apokalyptische Lehre, sondern in mindestens gleichem Masse apokalyptische Paränese"; J. Schmid:⁶ "Sie will nicht apokalyptische Belehrung bieten sondern ist eschatologisch motivierte Paränese"; H. Conzelmann:⁷ "Das vorherrschende Interesse liegt nicht, wie die Frage vermuten lassen könnte, bei der apokalyptischen Darstellung, sondern bei der richtigen Einstellung auf das Kommende, also bei der eschatologischen Paränese." The phrase "not apocalyptic but parenetic" has become almost a commonplace.

These insights concerning the overall purpose of the chapter are confirmed by a closer consideration of the form of the various sayings. Already Wellhausen⁸ recognized one of the primary character-

¹ C. C. Torrey, *Documents of the Primitive Church*, 1941, p. 14f. To be sure, Torrey thought that this chapter, with the exception of Vs 14a added in A.D. 40, could have been spoken by Jesus, which seems improbable. But his remarks as to the general character of Mk 13 still hold true.

² *synopt. Eschatologie*, p. 48. But even he has to recognize, p. 51, "Vs 24-27 hebt sich aus der ganzen Mahnrede heraus."

³ *Promise and Fulfillment*, p. 88.

⁴ In a private communication to Beasley-Murray, quoted *Jesus and the Future*, p. 100.

⁵ *Mk*, p. 285.

⁶ *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (R.N.T. 2), 1958², p. 237.

⁷ "Geschichte und Eschaton," p. 214.

⁸ *Mk*, p. 107.

istics of our chapter: "Nicht jüdisch ist aber auch die Anrede mit Ihr, wodurch die Schau in einfache Lehre verwandelt und allen apokalyptischen Firlefanz abgestreift wird. Denn zur Form der richtigen jüdischen Apokalypsen gehört es, dass der Seher selbst, der die Offenbarung empfangt, angeredet wird. . . oder dass er im Ich-stil erzählt, was er hat schauen und hören dürfen." And yet Vs 5-37 contain 19 imperatives! It is the fact of the duality of the apocalyptic and parenetic elements which has continually been a temptation to find an apocalyptical source, to which Christian parenetic had been added. But this is to approach the problem from the wrong side: the framework of the discourse is provided by the parenetic, to which apocalyptic elements have been "added." The characteristic words are βλέπετε (Vs 5, 9, 23, 33) and γρηγορεῖτε (34, 35, 37). It is easy enough to separate the hortatory elements, Vs 5b, 7a, 8b, 9a, 13b, 21, 23, 28-29, 33-37, from the apocalyptic elements, Vs 6, 7b, 8a, 14-20, 22, 24-27, a division which very nearly corresponds to the formal distinction between second and third person. It should be clear that this separation of different "elements" has nothing to do with literary criticism in the sense of looking for "sources", for neither series is capable of standing alone. We are only trying to isolate special characteristics of the chapter in order to determine the original function. If this characterization as parenetic with apocalyptic elements is allowed, two questions arise: who is being addressed in this exhortation? and how are the apocalyptic elements joined to this?

To answer the second question first, we shall recall the characteristic word γάρ. The importance of this word would have been noticed long ago, were it not for the unfortunate fact that it is missing in several places from the Nestle text, even though it is required by a synoptic comparison and is well attested. γάρ appears at the beginning of Vs 6, 7b, 8, 9b, 11b, 19, 22, 33, and 35. With the exception therefore of the longer sections 14-18 and 24-27, every apocalyptic element is attached to its context by a γάρ. The apocalyptic is therefore not an independent element in our text, but exists here only to provide the ground for the exhortation. Far from being the main point, it is always presupposed as something known, from which the speaker argues further to the consequences the hearer.¹

¹ In the section Mk 8:34-38, which goes progressively from exhortation to

When we examine the references to the parousia in the epistles to the Thessalonians, for example, we find the same situation, that apocalyptic is given in a parenthetic context as a ground, joined with γάρ. In 1 Thes 4:13ff, Paul exhorts the young church in regard to the problem of those having died before the expected consummation. They should not sorrow about the dead (13), for (γάρ) God will raise them (14). We know that God will raise them, for (γάρ) as the Lord said. . . and a description of the parousia follows (15-17). Therefore, exhort (παρακαλεῖτε) one another with these words (18). We see here very explicitly that apocalyptic is to be used for paraclesis. Again in 2 Thes 2:1ff the situation is an overly excited apocalyptic atmosphere, which Paul calms (1-3a), and then he gives the ground for his exhortation: for (ὅτι) the man of lawlessness is not yet revealed (3b-4). You know this (5-6), for (γάρ) the mystery of Anti-Christ is already at work (7).¹ To take another example, Didache 16 begins: watch, for (γάρ) you do not know the hour; meet often together, for (γάρ) the whole time of your faith will not help you, if it is not perfected in the end time. For (γάρ) lawlessness will increase. . . and there follows the apocalyptic section proper.² It is important to notice that the phrase introduced by γάρ is always a reference to something known and accepted, whether scripture, or a word of Jesus, or an established part of the kerygma, for otherwise the argument would have no power. We see therefore that the main function of Mk 13 is to provide eschatological exhortation, and that the "apocalyptic instruction" is introduced only to provide the ground for this exhortation.

The next question we have to answer is that of those being addressed in the second person. In the situation in Mark, it is of course the four disciples with Jesus. But when we observe Vs 37 we see who is meant: it is not the original disciples who are being told to keep on their guard, but the contemporaries of the author. This author is not however Mark, for the chapter did not originate as

eschatology, every sentence is connected to the preceding one by γάρ, Vs 35, 36, 37, 38.

¹ The passage that follows, Vs 8-12, is characterized by καὶ τότε as Mk 13:14 by ὅταν . . . τότε and Mk 13:24 by ἀλλὰ ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις, for both go beyond what is required by the situation.

² γάρ is regularly used to give the ground for an assertion or exhortation; cf. Blass-Debrunner, § 452. It is common in introducing quotations from the OT, being used by Paul for example Rm 4:3, 9; 9:9, 15; 10:5, 11, 13, 16; 11:34; 12:19; 13:9; 14:11; 1 Cor 1:19; 2:16; 3:19; 9:9; 10:26; 14:21; 15:27, 45; 2 Cor 6:2; 8:21; 9:7; Gal 5:14.

part of the gospel tradition. We have surmised that Mark probably took over the bulk of the discourse Vs 5-37 as sayings of the risen Christ on the Mount of Olives and composed his introduction accordingly. If this is true, then we have to ask about the source of the post-resurrection discourse, which has been indicated more by the general situation than by the actual form of the sayings. Except for the introduction in Vs 5a, there is no indication that Jesus is the speaker of most of the chapter, and the form-critical affinities of the material seem to show that he could not be so. These verses would not at all be out of place in one of the epistles, and they definitely do not belong from the very beginning in a gospel, or even in the mouth of the risen Christ. They are rather prophetic paraclesis and can be thought of as a "sermon" delivered probably to a group of Christians in Rome in the sixties of the first century. If so, it is not at all like such an ancient homily as 2 Clement, for these words are spoken with prophetic authority. They can, however, be compared with the sermons of Acts, where we find a combination of the kerygma with parenetic and midrash. But in this case, where the *Sitz im Leben* is not mission preaching but exhortation in an eschatological context to Christians, we find no kerygma as such. The development we have suggested, from a prophetic saying (cf. 1 Cor 15:51, *μυστήριον*) to a prophetic "word of the Lord" (cf. 1 Thes 4:15-17) to a message of the risen Christ (cf. Rev 1-3) to words of the incarnate Jesus, is one which can be seen elsewhere in the New Testament.¹ We must now ask the question as to the carriers of this tradition.

It has long been customary to speak of two lines of tradition in primitive Christianity, kerygma and didache. The first, which is thought to be best represented by Mark, has affinities with the Rabbinic *haggada*, which related primarily *ma'asim*. The second, represented by Q, is similar to the Rabbinic *halakha*, which transmits *debarim* and *meshalim*.² I would like to suggest for the *Sitz im*

¹ Cf. G. Bornkamm, "Die Verzögerung der Parousie," *In Memoriam Ernst Lohmeyer*, 1951, p. 118f. As Tertullian, *de resurrectione carnis*, 22, says, "prophecies were the Lord's own word."

² Cf. L. Baeck, "The Gospel as a Document of the History of the Jewish Faith," *Judaism and Christianity*, 1958, pp. 41-136. The analogy cannot be pressed too closely, however, because in contrast to the rabbinic tradition, the Christian *haggada* is of a normative character. Also the material known as Q is much more closely related to Aboth than to the rest of the Mishnah, and its real formal affinities are with the wisdom literature.

Leben of Mk 13 a third line of tradition, akin to the apocalyptic traditions of Judaism. To suggest that we should look among the early Christian prophets for the transmitters of our chapter is not to make a startling discovery, and yet Mk 13 seems never to have been considered consequently from this point of view.¹

If it was the function of an apostle to give the κήρυγμα to the church, of the teacher to give διδασκαλία, then the function of a prophet was to give παράκλησις. It is said of the prophets Judas and Silas, Acts 15:32, that they "exhorted (παρεκάλεσαν) the brethren with many words and strengthened them." It is said in 1 Cor 14:3, "He who prophesies speaks to men for their upbuilding and encouragement (παράκλησιν) and consolation (παραμυθίαν)." A short example of this exhortation is found in Acts 14:22, where Paul and Barnabas were "strengthening the souls of the disciples, exhorting (παρακαλοῦντες) them to continue in the faith, and saying that through many tribulations we must enter the Kingdom of God." The primary function of the Christian prophet was therefore paraclesis in the situation of the tribulation of the last days before the coming of the Kingdom. The double meaning of this word shows what is included: on the one hand ethical exhortation, an imperative, and on the other hand consolation, the ground for exhortation, an indicative. The Christian must endure the tribulation and persecution of this world, *because* of the promise of the Kingdom, which will be manifested in the near future. Paul exhorts the Thessalonians "a) to lead a life worthy of God, b) who calls you into his kingdom and glory" (1 Thes 2:12). In this sense 1 Peter is a prophetic writing, and Hebrews is even called a "word of exhortation (παρακλήσεως)", 13:22.²

If in the wider sense this eschatological exhortation is the framework of prophecy, it can also specifically be called a revelation of the place of the present in Heilsgeschichte.³ Here the second mean-

¹ Bo Reicke, "A Synopsis of Early Christian Preaching," *The Root of the Vine*, 1953, pp. 128-160, pp. 155ff, has suggested the connection without carrying it out in detail.

² But if this is paraclesis, Stählin has said (*TWNT* V, 820, 46f), "Die Träger des christlichen Trostes sind zunächst die Propheten der nt. lichen Gemeinde." This is what lends an inner probability to the attribution of Hebrews to Barnabas, the "son of exhortation" (בֶּרֶךְ-נְבוּאָה) by Tertullian, F. Dibelius, K. Bornhäuser, etc.

³ "Urchristliche Prophetie ist die aus Inspiration herausgeborene Rede charismatischer Verkündiger, durch die der Heilsplan Gottes mit der Welt

ing of paraclesis comes to the fore, that of giving the objective ground for enduring and hoping. The so-called predictions of the Christian prophets are to be seen in this light. On closer examination¹ it will be seen that early Christian prophecy fits into the general pattern of post-exilic prophecy, which could be characterized as charismatic exegesis. Thus the ground for the exhortation, the apocalyptic statement proper, is usually found to be a prophetic midrash of the Old Testament in the light of the present situation, as we have seen in Mk 13:14-20, 24-27. "Whatever was written before was written for our instruction (διδασκαλίαν), that through steadfastness (ὑπομονῆς) and the exhortation (παρακλήσεως) of the scriptures we might have hope" (Rm 15:4). The present situation, in the light of which the prophets searched the scriptures, can be characterized as a time of tribulation before the coming redemption. According to 1 Pet 1:10f, the result of searching the scriptures was knowledge about "who" and "when", the "sufferings unto Christ and the subsequent glory."² Paul and Barnabas travelled in Asia Minor "strengthening the souls of the disciples, exhorting them to remain steadfast in the faith, and saying: through many tribulations we must enter the kingdom of God" (Acts 14:22). Mk 13 is an example of this kind of paraclesis, in which the disciples are exhorted to stand fast in the present tribulation and to watch for the coming consummation.

We have seen that the framework of Mk 13 is provided by an eschatological paraclesis and have surmised that this paraclesis was addressed to the situation of a congregation of early Christians. If this is the case, we should expect to find similar exhortations to watch and stand fast in the literature of the New Testament which is directed directly to the situation, and when we turn to the epistles, we are not disappointed. A consideration of parallel passages in 1 Pet, James, Eph, and Col had led Carrington³ to include the rubrics *Vigilate* and *State* in his reconstruction of the primitive catechism he supposed to underlie many sections of parenetic in the epistles.

und der Gemeinde wie auch der Wille Gottes im Leben des einzelnen Christen bekannt wird." (G. Friedrich, *TWNT* VI, 849, 38ff).

¹ Cf. below, pp. 433-441.

² For the translation, cf. E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, 1958, p. 136. Even if the reference is to OT prophets, their activity is seen in the light of NT prophecy.

³ *The Primitive Christian Catechism*, 1940. Cf. A. Seeberg, *Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit*, 1903.

Selwyn has pointed out difficulties in this conception, principally the strongly eschatological context in 1 and 2 Thes and Romans, and he has suggested as a common source not catechism instruction but a persecution-torah,¹ the exhortation of early Christian prophets to a situation of persecution. Selwyn mentions among the common phrases found: persecution has been foretold and you should not be alarmed but rather rejoice, for it indicates that deliverance is at hand. Therefore be wakeful and sober and stand firm.

A consideration of the most important passages will show very clearly the common language involved:

But concerning the *times and seasons*, brethren, you do not need for us to write to you. *For* you know very well that the day of the Lord comes like a thief in the night. When they say, "Peace and security," then *suddenly* destruction will come on them like *pangs* come on a pregnant woman, and one will not be able to *escape*. But you, brethren, are not in the *darkness* that the day should surprise you like a thief. *For* you are all sons of *light* and sons of the day; we are not of the night or of darkness. Therefore let us not sleep like the rest, but let us keep *awake* and *sober*. *For* those who sleep sleep at night, and those who are *drunk* are drunk at night ... Let us be sober and put on the *breastplate* of faith and love and for a *helmet* the hope of salvation. *For* God has not destined us for wrath but to obtain salvation Therefore *exhort* one another and build one another up. (1 Thes 5:1-11)

But concerning the *coming* of our Lord Jesus Christ ... we beg you, brethren, not to be quickly shaken in mind or *alarmed* ... Let no one *deceive* you in any way, *for first* the rebellion must come and the man of lawlessness be revealed Do you not remember that when I was still with you I *told you* this? ... Therefore, brethren, *stand fast*. (2 Thes 2:1-15)

And all this knowing the *time*, that already now is the hour for you to *wake* from sleep; *for* salvation is now nearer to us than when we first believed. The night is advanced, the day has *come near*. Let us put off then the works of *darkness* and put on the *armor* of *light*; let us behave seemingly as in the day, not in revelling or *drunkenness* ... (Rm 13:11-14)

Be strong in the Lord and in the strength of his might. Put on the whole *armor* of God, that you may be able to *stand* *For* our struggle ... is with the world rulers of this *darkness* *Stand* therefore and ... put on the *breastplate* of righteousness and ... the *helmet* of salvation ... *praying* at all times in the Spirit, and to this end keep *awake*. (Eph 6:10-18)

¹ 1 *Peter*, pp. 439-458.

The *end* of all things has *come near*; therefore be sane and *sober* for *prayer*. (1 Pet 4:7)

Be *sober*, be *awake*. (1 Pet 5:8)

Therefore be *patient*, brethren, until the *coming* of the Lord . . . You also be *patient*, strengthen your hearts, for the *coming* of the Lord has *come near*. (Jas 5:7-9)

We can add one last extract, which clearly belongs with the above passages from the epistles, but which comes from the Gospel of Luke, as his ending to the eschatological discourse:

Watch out for yourselves lest your hearts be heavy with dissipation and *drunkenness* and worldly cares, and that day come on you *suddenly* like a snare . . . But *watch* at all times, *praying* that you may be strong to *escape* all these things which are going to happen and to *stand* before the Son of Man. (Lk 21:34-36)

The origin of this language, not in the tradition of sayings of Jesus, but in the eschatological paracletic of the church, leads us to posit something similar for the framework of Mk 13. C.H. Dodd says about the eschatological discourse: "The burden of the *paraenesis* here is closely similar to that of the eschatological section of the *catechesis*, and its style, though not identical, is sufficiently similar, and sufficiently unlike the prevailing style of some other parts of the Gospels, to warrant the belief that some relation existed between them at an early stage of the formation of the tradition."¹ Let us consider once more the parenetic framework of Mk 13:

Watch that no one leads you astray. (5b)

And when you hear of wars and rumors of wars do not be alarmed. (7a)

These are the beginnings of the pangs. (8b)

But watch yourselves. (9a)

But he who endures to the end will be saved. (13b)

And then if anyone should say to you: "see, here is the Messiah", "see, there", do not believe it. (21)

But you take care! I have told you all beforehand. (23)

From the fig tree learn the parable: when you see its branch already become soft and it puts forth leaves, you know that the summer is near. Thus you too, when you see this happening, know that it is near, at the gate. (28-29).

¹ "The Primitive Catechism and the Sayings of Jesus," *New Testament Essays*, pp. 106-118, p. 113.

Take heed, watch and pray! (For you do not know when the time is...) (33)

Watch therefore, (for you do not know when the lord of the house comes...) (35a)

What I say to you I say to all: watch. (37)

Printed in this fashion, without the objective grounds for the exhortation, which we have seen were attached to the framework by a γάρ, it is clear where the form-critical affinities of this material lie.

In our discussion of the exhortation in Mk 13:33-37, we have already suggested that the origin of this paracletic language of the church is to be sought in the parables of watchfulness. As is well known, these parables are among the most difficult to trace back to a situation in the life of Jesus, for they show the most influence of their transmission by the early church. Not only has the general situation of watchfulness influenced the church's paraclesis, but this very language of the church has in its turn also influenced the telling of the parables, as can be seen in such secondary applications as Mt 25:13 ("Watch therefore, for you know neither the day nor the hour"). Nevertheless, the essence of these parables goes back undoubtedly to Jesus,¹ and it is here that we can see the origin of the paraclesis of the early prophets. Mk 13:33-37 occupies a place midway between the synoptic parables and the exhortation of the epistles. Thus γρηγορεῖν (cf. μὴ καθεύδειν, ἀγρυπνεῖν, βλέπειν) in Vs 35 and 37 can be paralleled in the parables of Mt 24:43; Lk 12:37, 39, and on the other hand in the paracletic passages 1 Thes 5:6, 10; 1 Pet 5:8; Rev 3:3; 16:15; Acts 20:31. In the similar section Lk 21:34-36, we find the image of the thief, which comes from the parable Mt 24:33; Lk 12:39, and develops into the mere expressions of 1 Thes 5:2, 4; 2 Pet 3:10; Rev 3:3; 16:15. One could well suppose that the expressions "like a snare" Lk 21:35, and "like birthpangs", 1 Thes 5:3 (cf. Jn 16:21), are also remnants of fuller parables.

The function of this exhortation, in the situation of the parables as in the paraclesis of the church, could be summed up in the words

¹ They are consequently assigned completely to the situation of the church only by E. Grässer, *Das Problem der Parusieverzögerung in den synoptischen Evangelien und in der Apostelgeschichte*, 1957, on which cf. O. Cullmann, "Parusieverzögerung und Urchristentum," *ThLZ* 83 (1958), pp. 1-12.

of Mk 13:13b, "He who endures to the end will be saved." There are thus two elements involved, the *ὑπομονή*, the endurance, patience of the disciples, which means that they should not expect the end too early; and the fact that they can endure all tribulations because the end will come to deliver them and take vengeance on their oppressors. The emphasis of the exhortation, however, is on the first part, on enduring the tribulation. It can be grounded in the sufferings of Jesus (2 Cor 1:5; 1 Pet 4:13), or in the fact that these sufferings have been predicted (1 Thes 3:4; 1 Pet 2:21; Acts 14:22). The situation can be seen in Paul urging the Thessalonians "not to be quickly shaken in mind or alarmed . . . to the effect that the day of the Lord has come" (2 Thes 2:2). When that day comes, it will come suddenly, but until then: endure and watch.

This tradition of eschatological exhortation has left its mark in several places of the gospel tradition. It can be observed especially well in Mk 13, where as we have seen it provides the framework of the whole chapter. But it is also probable that the parables of Mt 24-25 were transmitted in this context, which can be seen by the secondary applications using the language of the prophets. In some cases parables have been reapplied to this purpose, although the original meaning was quite different. Thus Lk 18:1-8 is probably but a variant of the more general parable Lk 11:5-8. Just after the discourse against the Pharisees in Mt 23 follows the eschatological discourse, and this connection is also to be found in Luke, where after 11:37-12:1 there follows a body of eschatological exhortation in 12:2-12, (22-34), 35-46. It may very well be that this section of Luke has had a history similar to that of Mk 13, and that these words were once part of a prophetic discourse and only afterwards put into the mouth of Jesus.¹ Finally, the material in Jn 14-17 has also at one time been transmitted by prophets, and it provides parallels to every verse in Mk 13, but now it appears under a specifically Johannine impress.

¹ Interesting is the parallel of Lk 12:41 ("Peter said, 'Lord, are you telling this parable for us or for all?'") to Mk 13:37 (Jesus said, "what I say to you I say to all.").

3. THE GENESIS OF MARK 13

It is sometimes useful at the end of a long analysis to attempt a synthesis, if only to provide a summary of what has been said. It is of course much easier to distinguish various elements in a composition than to explain how, and when, and by whom they came to be put together. The reconstruction of the history of Mk 13 which follows will therefore be largely hypothetical. The mere attempt, however, acts as a check on the correctness of our previous analysis, for we should at least be able to imagine how it might have happened.

We have suggested that there was a prophetic tradition in early Christianity, Christian prophets who treasured words of the head of their prophetic school and who searched the scriptures to be able to interpret these "words of the Lord" to the situation of their contemporaries. It is in such a group that we have to think of the tradents of our material. We have seen that the core of Mk 13 is the unfulfilled oracle of Vs 14-19, which has its origin sometime between the winter of A.D. 39/40 and the winter of 40/41. The injunction to flee, which uses words of Jesus from a midrash on Lot, is here adequately motivated. It is of course possible that the oracle, which has nothing specifically Christian about it and seems to address all Judea, may have been originally the utterance of a Jewish prophet. This hypothesis brings more difficulties than it solves, however, for we would then have to explain how it is that a Jewish prophet is using words of Jesus (Vs 15f), or conversely how it is that words of a Jewish prophet were able to enter the Christian tradition at two different points, here and in Q. The simplest supposition then is that these words were from the beginning the work of Christian prophets. This "word of the Lord" was not simply discarded when it failed of fulfillment, nor did it find the convenient explanation of the "restrainer" of 2 Thes, but it was handed down among the prophets and thought to have its fulfillment in the future.

The original oracle referred to a situation similar to that of the time of Daniel: a desecration of the temple resulting in war and great hardship. The oracle was then reapplied to refer to the fall of Jerusalem. Because Jesus had spoken of a decisive event which was to happen at some time during the lifetime of those who witnessed his death, and because he was also known to have predicted the fall of Jerusalem, these two events were combined, and the

oracle of A.D. 40, now interpreted of the coming catastrophe in Jerusalem, was expanded by the addition of Vs 20, 24-27, telling of the early parousia. That these verses do not agree with the intention of Jesus is shown by the fact that the exegesis of Dn 7:13f presupposed is quite a different one from his. Given the presupposition of the author, however, we found that these words were the result of a careful examination of Old Testament scripture. It may have been that they were once part of a longer Christian apocalypse, but we have no way of knowing. In any case, the author seems to have known nothing of the Anti-Christ, although the idea lies near enough at hand for anyone thinking of the Son of Man in terms of Dn 7.

The next stage in the tradition, whether in Judea or Rome one cannot say, was the inclusion of this oracle in the exhortation of a Christian prophet. This covered essentially Vs 5-13, 21f, and perhaps 33-36. That the original oracle has been included in a discourse with a slightly different function is shown by the difference in form involved. Vs 14-20, 24-27 were therefore not composed by the author of the exhortation, but taken over en bloc. There was, however, a good reason for using the oracle, for it had prophetic authority, and it suited the purpose of the exhortation to have its climax in a promise of the parousia. Just as in Vs 5-8 the exhortation is followed phrase for phrase by an objective ground, so the description of the near parousia provides the objective ground for the whole discourse. Nevertheless, it was essentially the parousia alone which was interesting in this context, and not the Vs 14-19, which have been included only because they were already attached to the parousia, and which were by now far removed from their original function. We have the case of an author quoting more than necessary to make his point, with the extraneous context later assuming more importance in the interpretation of the whole than was intended.¹

The hypothesis of a further step before the material of this chapter came to Mark was perhaps unnecessary. It may have been that Mark has taken up Vs 5-27 directly from the prophetic tradition and made the additions to the end of the chapter himself. But for

¹ Cf. 1 Thes 4:16-17, where the only part of the "word of the Lord" which was necessary was that part concerning those still alive at the parousia (cf. P. Nepper-Christensen, "Das verborgene Herrnwort," *Stud. Theol.* 19 (1965), pp. 136-154.); or cf. 1 Cor 15:3-7, where it was really only necessary to cite the resurrection (cf. H. W. Bartsch, "Die Argumentation des Paulus in 1 Cor 15:3-11," *ZNW* 55 (1964), pp. 261-274).

the sake of the setting indicated in Vs 3-4, we have assumed that at one stage in the tradition our chapter was conceived as being words of the risen Christ spoken on the Mount of Olives.

However this may be, after the prophetic discourse was thought of as having been spoken by Jesus—and indeed many of its words were based on actual saying from the gospel tradition—then the *verba Christi* in the rest of the chapter, Vs 28-37, were added. We have surmised that they were attached gradually to the discourse, first Vs 28-30, then 31 and 32, and finally 33-36. It may be that these latter Vs 33-36 were already a part of the prophetic discourse, but because they are at the end it is also possible that they were added last. These additions to the chapter were not just loosely attached, but they were composed in the light of what had come before them, which gives a unity to the whole chapter. Although the situation had changed from a discourse of a prophet to a discourse of Jesus, the function of the chapter as eschatological exhortation remained the same.

We come finally to the contribution of Mark.¹ Vs 23 and 37, which show that it is the Christians who are addressed and not just the disciples, are perhaps from him, although they also could have belonged to the prophetic discourse.² It is also possible that Mark has added the night-watch in four parts in Vs 35b. He has also made a slight but very significant change in Vs 14, which he has interpreted not just of the great tribulation at the fall of Jerusalem but of a manifestation of the Anti-Christ. When we consider the use made of Daniel in Vs 14, it is an interpretation which lies near at hand and could have been made by anyone. That it was first made by Mark is shown by the fact that it depends on the phrase "let the reader understand." It was therefore first in a written document that the grammatical peculiarity of ἐστὸς was created or exploited, and we have no evidence that the tradition of our chapter was ever written before Mark.

Mark's most important contribution to the eschatological discourse, however, one which has mislead interpreters down to the present, is provided by the setting of the whole discourse as an

¹ For the Markan understanding of the chapter as a whole, cf. below, pp. 477-479.

² The additions of "in my name" in Vs 6 and "for my sake" in Vs 9 could have come at any time since the discourse was put into the mouth of Jesus up to as late as it is still possible for the interpolation of a copyist to get into all our MSS.

answer to a question concerning the destruction of the temple. He has managed thereby to give a completely new interpretation both to the saying of Jesus in Vs 2 and to the oracle concerning the appalling sacrilege in Vs 14ff. Whereas the original oracle spoke of the *desecration* of the temple, the later prophetic discourse referred to the destruction of *Jerusalem* as the herald of the last great tribulation of the end times. Mark gives his source quite a different aspect when he makes it refer by virtue of its position to the *destruction of the temple*.¹ This shift in accent raises questions which must be discussed in some detail, questions concerning a) the destruction of the temple, and b) the destruction of Jerusalem.

¹ "Erst Markus redet nun von einer tatsächlichen Zerstörung," Marxsen, *Mk*, p. 113.

CHAPTER THREE

JESUS AND THE TEMPLE

It truly lies in nothing other than the nature of the material that we have postulated such a complicated development behind Mark 13. How could it be otherwise when the transmitted sayings contain predictions of Jesus concerning the time of the transmitting church, and when the transmitters had the authority of prophets? Now we must attempt to penetrate through the writings of the church to the situation of Jesus himself. What did Jesus say 1. with respect to the future of Jerusalem, and 2. with respect to the temple? It is methodologically advisable to consider these two questions separately, for we cannot assume a priori that they belong together. We shall therefore first investigate the attitude of the early Christians, and hopefully arrive at Jesus' own attitude, concerning the temple as the location of the cult and the dwelling place of the Shekinah, and not merely as one exceedingly important part of the city of Jerusalem. Only against this background can we go on to speak of the destruction of this temple.

Did Jesus predict the destruction of the Jerusalem temple? Is the saying previously examined in Mark 13:2 a genuine saying of Jesus? Most scholars¹ answer this question affirmatively, and they further

¹ The saying is usually combined with the supposedly similar saying Mk 14:58 and as such is held to be genuine by R. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, Göttingen, 1958⁴, pp. 126f; M. Goguel, *La Vie de Jésus*, Paris, 1932 = *The Life of Jesus*, New York, 1948, pp. 507ff; "La parole de Jésus sur la destruction et la reconstruction de temple," *Jubilé Alfred Loisy*, Vol. I, Paris-Amsterdam, 1928, pp. 117-136; E. Klostermann, *Das Markusevangelium*, Tübingen, 1950⁴, p. 155; E. Lohmeyer, *Das Evangelium des Markus*, Göttingen, 1959¹⁵, p. 268; V. Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, London, 1963, pp. 566ff; J. Schniewind, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (NTD 1), Göttingen, 1947⁴, p. 181; J. Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Marci*, Berlin, 1909², p. 131; W. G. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfillment*, London, 1957, pp. 94ff; M. Simon, "Retour du Christ et reconstruction du temple dans la pensée chrétienne primitive," *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne*, Neuchatel, 1950, pp. 247-257, pp. 249f; O. Cullmann, *Petrus, Jünger-Apostel-Märtyrer*, Zürich, 1952, pp. 222f; R. A. Hoffmann, "Das Wort Jesu von der Zerstörung und dem Wiederaufbau des Tempels," *Neutestamentliche Studien* (für) *Georg Heinrici*, Leipzig, 1914, pp. 130-139, p. 131; J. Jeremias, *Jesus als Weltvollender*, Gütersloh, 1930, pp. 39f; E. Lohmeyer, *Kultus und Evangelium*, Göttingen, 1942, pp. 77ff; O. Michel,

interpret the saying eschatologically, in accordance therefore with the context Mark gives it. We must now test the validity of this often presupposed but seldom examined common opinion. We shall be not so much concerned with the genuineness of the saying as with the question of the original reference. We must question whether or not Mark interpreted it correctly when he gave it the setting of Mark 13:1-4.¹ Indeed, we have already concluded that the saying itself, "There will not be left here stone upon stone that will not be thrown down," is a genuine saying of Jesus. What is now at issue is the reference to the temple, which is not part of the saying itself but which has been read into it even by those who recognize the setting to be secondary. We have already made reference to the very similar saying Luke 19:44, "They will not leave stone upon stone in thee," a threat directed not against the temple, but against the city of Jerusalem. It is, of course, possible that two similar sayings were spoken on two different occasions with two different objects; but it is much more probable that only one version is original in the situation of Jesus, while the other has been modified by the tradition. It is usually said² that the "political" conception of Luke is secondary to the "eschatological" one of Mark, and this will be investigated in Chapter IV. Now we have to ask whether or not it is probable that Jesus could have directed these words against the temple, or whether it is more likely that the original reference was to Jerusalem as a whole.

The prediction of Mark 13:2 is usually discussed in connection with another saying which occurs in the context of the trial of Jesus. Bultmann, for example, discusses Mark 13:2 together with Mark 14:58 (Matt. 26:61), Mark 15:29, John 2:19 and Acts 6:14 as different formulations of one single tradition.³ It is, however, very doubtful

Das Zeugnis des Neuen Testaments von der Gemeinde, Gütersloh, 1941, pp. 24ff; A. Oepke, *Das neue Gottesvolk*, Gütersloh, 1950, p. 169; R. N. Flew, *Jesus and His Church*, London, 1938, pp. 40ff; G. Dellings, *Der Gottesdienst im Neuen Testament*, 1952, pp. 26ff; A. Cole, *The New Temple*, London, 1951, pp. 18ff. Few follow G. Hölscher, "Der Ursprung der Apokalypse Mk 13," *ThBl* 12 (1933), 193-202, p. 193, in his assertion that the saying is a vaticinium ex eventu.

¹ The determination that this section is a composition of the evangelist (cf. above, pp. 10-13) does not necessarily mean that he does not use it in accordance with the intention of Jesus. This must be determined in our present investigation.

² Most sharply by Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 101, n. 47.

³ He has a predecessor in the ancient church in the western text, where

that Mark 13:2 belongs here at all. This saying, which as we have seen does not even mention the temple, has at the most one word in common with Mark 14:58, καταλυθῆ/καταλύω, and the construction of the sentence is quite different. Mark 13:2 is a prediction, or better a threat, formulated in the passive voice. All the other passages on the other hand have two members, which refer clearly in active form to the destruction of the temple in the first and, with the exception of Acts 6:14, mention the building of a new temple in the second. It is with this latter saying that the present chapter will be concerned.

It appears in its simplest form in the mouth of mockers under the cross, who throw into Jesus' face an apparently well known saying: "You who destroy (καταλύων) and build (οικοδομῶν) in three days the temple" (Mk 15:29 = Mt 27:40). The participial formulation is due to the construction of the sentence, but otherwise the formulation is simple and lacking any additional interpretation by the evangelists, which will help us in discussing the other passages.

At the trial of Jesus before the High Priest false witnesses arise who declare against Jesus: "We have heard him say: I will destroy this temple which is made with hands and in three days build another which is not made with hands" (Mk 14:58). Before we come to the saying itself, there are three preliminary questions to be discussed: 1. the problem of the historicity of this trial altogether, 2. the sense in which the witnesses are called "false," and 3. the particular interpretation of Mark.

The grave historical difficulties which the synoptic accounts of this trial give to anyone considering it in the light of Jewish jurisprudence are well known.¹ Many of them can be avoided when we assume that the Sanhedrin was not involved at all but rather only the High Priest and his counsellors.² This more informal hearing occurred

Mk 13:2 reads as follows: "there will not be left stone upon stone that will not be thrown down, and in three days another will be erected without hands." D thereby attempts to interpret Mark in accordance with Jn 2:19, for this MSS also reads ἀναστήσω for οἰκοδομήσω in Mk 14:58.

¹ Cf. H. Lietzmann, *Der Prozess Jesu* (Sitzungsberichte d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. phil.-hist. Kl. 23-24, pp. 310-322), Berlin, 1931; M. Goguel, *Life*, pp. 502ff; G. Bornkamm, *Jesus von Nazareth*, Stuttgart, 1956, pp. 150f; O. Cullmann, *Der Staat im Neuen Testament*, Tübingen, 1956, pp. 44ff; P. Winter, *On the Trial of Jesus*, Berlin 1961. The historicity is bravely defended by J. Blinzler, *Der Prozess Jesu*, Regensburg, 1955².

² So A. Büchler, *Das Synedrion in Jerusalem und das grosse Beth-Din in der Quaderkammer des jerusalemischen Tempels*, Wien, 1902; J. Z. Lauterbach,

not at night but in the morning (Lk 22:66, Mk 15:1) for the purpose of formulating a charge against Jesus to make to the Roman authorities (Lk 23:2). For our purposes, however, the literary considerations are much more important. Bultmann¹ considers the entire section Mk 14:55-64 to be a secondary insertion. He points out in addition that Vs. 57-59, which contain the statement concerning the temple, are a further secondary addition to their present context, being a doublet to Vs. 56: "for many testified falsely against him² and the testimonies did not agree."³ The episode of the false witnesses with the temple saying, then, being an insertion in an insertion, was not only not a part of the oldest passion story, but did not even originally belong in the individual story of Jesus' trial before the High Priest.

This observation is important for the problem of the false witnesses, for now we need not be misled by historical considerations. It may well be that a saying against the temple was important in Jesus' condemnation,⁴ but the passage Mk 14:57-59 is in no sense a direct report of what happened. We therefore do not need to trouble ourselves with the insoluble problem of the sense in which the witnesses did not agree,⁵ for this detail has its origin in the

"Sanhedrin," *Jewish Encyclopedia*, XI, 41ff; G. F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*, III, Cambridge, Mass., 1930, pp. 32ff; and most recently H. Mantel, *Studies in the History of the Sanhedrin*, Cambridge, Mass., 1961, especially pp. 54-101.

¹ *syn. Trad.*, pp. 290ff. Writing from an entirely different point of view, Taylor agrees with him, for the ancient Roman passion story which he reconstructs (*Mark*, pp. 653-664) also does not contain these verses. Cf. further M. Dibelius, *Botschaft und Geschichte*, Bd. I, Tübingen, 1953, pp. 248-257; Goguel, *Life*, pp. 511f; T. A. Burkill, "St. Mark's Philosophy of the Passion," *NT* 2 (1958), 245-271.

² Cf. Vs 57: "some stood up and testified falsely against him."

³ Cf. Vs 59: "and even so their testimony did not agree."

⁴ Speaking for this conclusion is the fact that the same accusation is found Mk 15:29 in a different strand of tradition, and perhaps even the partially parallel case of Jesus son of Ananias, who was brought before the Roman governor for speaking against the temple (but was then released as a politically harmless maniac), Josephus, B. J. VI, 303ff. For the view that the temple saying was important in Jesus' trial, cf. G. D. Kilpatrick, *The Trial of Jesus*, Oxford, 1953, pp. 10-13. More important perhaps are the arguments against it: that the independent Lucan passion tradition (cf. below, pp. 248-249, and Bultmann, *syn. Trad.*, p. 291, "das mutmassliche Fehlen der Nebenquelle des Lukas") and Johannine passion tradition (cf. C. H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge, 1963, pp. 88ff) know nothing of a temple saying in connection with this hearing.

⁵ On the face of it the remark is absurd, for if witnesses really did conspire to give false testimony, then of course they would make sure that they agreed

general report of Vs 56. This qualification of the witnesses as false provides an important indication of the context in which the saying was transmitted to Mk and shows how it could be inserted at this point, but it can hardly be taken to mean that Mark only wanted thereby to deny that Jesus had said such a thing. The early church was accused again and again of opposition to the temple, in the case of Stephen (Acts 6:13f), Paul (Acts 21:28) and all the apostles (Evan. Pet VII, 26). It appears that this saying in Mk 14:58 was important in the anti-Christian polemic of the time of Mark and has for this reason found a place in his account. Just as it is probable that it is the church and not the historical Jesus who is accused of blasphemy for calling a crucified one "the Son of the Blessed," so it is the later anti-Christian witnesses who were using a supposed saying of Jesus against his followers who are here characterized as false.

Goguel¹ thinks that a genuine saying of Jesus was much too radical for the early church, and that it was therefore weakened in the various accounts. But how does he know that a saying against the temple would be objectionable to the Christian congregation? It is supposedly one weakening of the force of the saying when Mark lets it be spoken by "false witnesses," and another when he "spiritualizes" the saying through the addition of the words *χειροποίητος* / *ἀχειροποίητος*. These words are, of course, familiar terms from the early Christian catechesis on the theme "temple" (cf. Acts 7:48; 17:24, Heb 9:11, 24) and are widely recognized to be additions of the evangelist here. They could weaken the saying by interpretation, as could the characterization of the witness as false weaken it by denial; but both motifs together could not operate simultaneously, for they work against each other. If the saying were really objectionable to Mark, he could have simply omitted it, instead

with one another. Matthew recognizes this absurdity and so removes the notice about the disagreeing testimony and does not call the witnesses false. We must beware of historizing "explanations" such as that of J. A. Kleist, "The Two False Witnesses (Mk 14:55ff)," *CBQ* 9 (1947), 321-323, who finds the disagreement in that one witness would have said Jesus would destroy, the other that he would build the temple. The often repeated conception of Hoffmann, "Wort Jesu," p. 131, that the witnesses were false because they said *Jesus* would destroy the temple, whereas in fact he had only predicted its destruction by others, also rests on a misunderstanding of the text.

¹ "Parole," p. 129; cf. Hoffmann, "Wort Jesu," p. 131; Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, Göttingen, 1959²⁶, p. 89, n. 7; Taylor, *Mark*, p. 566; Lohmeyer, *Markus*, p. 327.

of taking all the trouble of adding it to a story which did not originally contain it. But since he has added it, it must mean not only that he knew the saying from the Jewish polemic, but that it was very important to him for its positive content. The additions do not weaken the saying but clarify it; that is, they bring out the original meaning of what Mark thinks is a genuine saying of Jesus. Even if Mark first learned of this saying from opponents of the church who used it negatively, still it was very important to him in its positive content.

Mt 26:61 reads, "I can (δύναμαι) destroy and in three days build the temple of God." Contrary to Goguel, there is also no weakening in the "I can." If it were objectionable to Matthew to ascribe the destruction of the temple to Jesus—and what reason do we have for thinking so?—would it be less objectionable to ascribe to him the possibility? In fact, we have here only a translation variant,¹ whereby as so often in such cases, Matthew comes closest to the supposed original. In any case, it is only in the version of Matthew, where it is a question of the authority of Jesus, that there is any plausible transition to the following Messianic question.² That Mark chose the future form is perhaps an indication that he is more interested in the destruction of the temple than Matthew. With respect to the other differences in the saying as it is found in Matthew and Mark, we can for the present be content with the observation that they agree with the tendencies of the two evangelists. Mark wants to emphasize the difference between old and new, as we saw with the contrast "made . . . not made with hands," and, accordingly, he calls the temple to be built "another" and speaks disparagingly of "this" temple. Matthew, on the other hand, who wants to emphasize the continuity between old and new, says αὐτὸν and speaks of the "temple of God".

The Fourth Gospel contains the temple saying in connection with the cleansing of the temple in somewhat different form: "destroy

¹ "Das . . . aramäische Imperfekt im Galiläisch-Aramäischen (wird) nur ganz begrenzt futurisch, fast immer jussivisch, final oder modal gebraucht," Jeremias, *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu*, Göttingen, 1960³, p. 202. P. Joüon, *L'Evangile de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ*, Paris, 1930, on Mt 7:4, points out that "πῶς ἐρεῖς your brother" (Mt 7:4) = "πῶς δύνασαι λέγειν your brother" (Lk 6:42). Cf. further G. Dalman, *Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch*, Leipzig, 1905, § 61, 1, a and d (p. 264).

² Cf. M. Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, Tübingen, 1933² p. 199. Perhaps Mark intended the same thing with his emphasized ἐγώ.

(λύσατε) this temple, and in three days I will raise it (ἐγερῶ)" (Jn 2:19), and the evangelist adds as explanation: "he spoke of the temple of his body" (2:21). This explanation is also the reason for the differences. Ἐγείρειν can refer to the erection of a building like οἰκοδομεῖν, but the word is used more frequently for the raising of Jesus (cf. Vs 22). Also, the imperative λύσατε does not represent by any means the original form of the saying, but is used because of the Johannine interpretation, where a statement in the first person would be impossible. Since the verbal form has been chosen primarily for this reason, it is not an ironical invitation,¹ and it is also not used in a concessive sense,² but it is rather future: "You will kill me, and then. . ."³ Thereby a favorite evasion of the difficulties posed by Mt 14:58 has been cut off.⁴ Whatever the case in the early church, it is very objectionable for many today to ascribe to Jesus the destruction of the temple, and therefore they prefer the imperative form of Jn 2:19.⁵ But even if the Johannine interpretation should be the correct one, it does not represent the original form of the saying.

The version in Acts 6:14 is less important for our present purposes, for here the saying is cited at third hand. "False witnesses" accuse Stephen of speaking against temple and law in that he says, "This Jesus of Nazareth will destroy this place and change the customs Moses gave us." Here again we have a construction in two members, and it is at least conceivable that the second accusation might be a polemic twisting of Jesus' statement about the new temple. The whole weight lies, however, in the first accusation, and one has the

¹ Bultmann, *Johannes*, p. 88; Ph. Vielhauer, *Oikodome*, Karlsruhe, 1940, p. 64.

² = ἐὰν καὶ λύσητε, Blass-Debrunner, *Grammatik*, 387:2; Jeremias, *Weltvollender*, p. 43, n. 3; C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge, 1953, p. 302, n. 1; C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St. John*, London, 1955, p. 166.

³ W. Bauer, *Das Johannesevangelium*, Tübingen, 1933³, p. 48; cf. W. Hahn, *Gottesdienst und Opfer Christi*, Göttingen, 1951, p. 54.

⁴ "Das Jesus es so gesprochen hat, wie die Juden ihm (in den Synoptikern) vorwerfen . . . hat wenig Wahrscheinlichkeit. Dagegen lässt sich die synoptische Form des Wortes gut begreifen, wenn sie eine jüdische Verdrehung des Rätselwortes, wie es Johannes bringt, ist," F. Büchsel, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (NTD 4), Göttingen, 1934, p. 48.

⁵ Wellhausen, *Markus*, p. 131; C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, London, 1935, pp. 60ff; H. Wenschkewitz, *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe: Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament*, Leipzig, 1932, pp. 100ff; Cole, *New Temple*, p. 21.

impression from the following speech that it might very well be justified, that Stephen could have said exactly that. In any case, we see once more that a saying of Jesus was known in the early church, which the Jews constantly used in their anti-Christian polemic, but in which the church (except for Stephen!) was also interested for its positive content.

It is not completely valueless to try to reconstruct the original form of the saying which lies behind all the variants: καταλύσω (or better: **אסח**) τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον¹ καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις² οἰκοδομήσω αὐτόν.³ This saying poses so many difficulties that we will not be able to give a satisfactory explanation until the end of this chapter.

We recall once more the background of the saying, that its appearances on the lips of anti-Christian witnesses (Mk 14:58, Acts 6:14) or mockers (Mk 15:29) is an indication of its transmission in Jewish polemic and its use in a negative sense. On the other hand, Mark and John are interested in the saying for its positive content: they accept the saying made by accusers of the church but interpret it in a different sense, of the eschatological congregation or of Jesus' resurrected body. These two different uses to which the saying was put have produced a certain tension in the saying itself which is all too often ignored by interpreters.

Hoffmann⁴ finds it "ein zu phantastisches Gedanke" (p. 131) that Jesus really wanted to destroy the temple, or even that he had urged the Jews to do so (Jn 2:19). Not only are these conceptions "Phantastereien" (p. 133), but also the rebuilding in three days is "etwas stark Phantastisches" (p. 134). Therefore, Hoffmann weakens the first statement by bringing in the saying Mk 13:2, so that Jesus only predicted a future destruction as divine judgment without ascribing to himself any part in the destruction.⁵ The second statement is also only a prediction of the new temple in the new aeon, for the Kingdom of God is "die Verklärung aller irdischen

¹ Mk 14:58; Jn 2:19; Acts 6:14.

² Mk 14:58; 15:29; Jn 2:19. διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν would be better Greek, but there is no real difference in meaning.

³ or ἄλλον, but Mark emphasizes the difference, and both Mt 26:61 and Jn 2:19 read αὐτόν. A similar reconstruction is found also in Lohmeyer, *Markus*, p. 326, and W. Hahn, *Gottesdienst*, p. 56.

⁴ "Wort Jesu".

⁵ "Man wird also nicht daran zweifeln dürfen, dass Jesus die Zerstörung des jerusalemischen Heiligtums geweissagt hat. Aber sich selbst hat er darin schwerlich als καταλύων bezeichnet," "Wort Jesu," p. 131.

Verhältnisse" and must, therefore, include all of the rites of the law including those of the temple. "Die Erfüllung der Gesetzesvorschriften setzt aber eine Art von Tempelkultus auch für die Erwählten des neuen Gottesreiches voraus. Die Paschallämmer müssen geschlachtet werden." (p. 135.) We have seen that it is illegitimate to interpret the first half of the saying through the use of Mk 13:2 or Jn 2:19. As for the rites of the future temple, it is this which seems to me "fantastic."

Bultmann¹ is more careful but offers essentially the same explanation. The first possibility that he considers² is that the saying is an expression of the Jewish expectation of a new Temple in the messianic age, with emphasis on the building and not destruction. Bultmann cannot then understand why the saying should have been offensive to anyone or why Jesus should be the subject of this future building. He, too, has been misled by the application of the impersonally formulated saying in Mk 13:2.

It is characteristic of almost all interpreters (Lohmeyer is the exception) to put all the weight of their interpretation on the second half of the saying. The destruction was only predicted, as a judgment or perhaps only as a necessary precondition, while Jesus' claim is restricted to building the new temple.³ Nevertheless, if the first statement is considered at all, since it speaks of the destruction of the Jerusalem temple, the second statement must also refer to a literal temple. Jeremias, after attempting to demonstrate a connection between the coming of the Messiah and the building of the new temple, is to say the least ambiguous when he says: "der Tempel wird zerstört werden (vgl. Mk 13, 1 par), aber nach der Zerstörung des Tempels wird Jesu Parusie und der Bau des himmlischen Tempels, der verkärten Gemeinde, erfolgen."⁴ Plooijs sees correctly that the first statement really does speak of Jesus destroying the temple but then he goes on to interpret the second statement in an entirely different sense: "Jesus wished to abolish entirely the Temple and the service of sacrifices and all it includes; in its stead a new spiri-

¹ *syn. Trad.*, p. 126f; cf. *Johannes*, p. 88.

² For the second, the origin of the saying in the same mythology as that of the Mandaean Book of John 76, cf. below, p. 153f.

³ What really lurks in the minds of many was stated clearly by Delling, *Gottesdienst*, p. 27: the saying about the destruction of the temple means that "die jüdische Frömmigkeit ist im Abbruch begriffen." This is of course illegitimate.

⁴ *Weltvollendung*, p. 39f.

tual Temple was to be erected" as described in 1 Pet 2:4f.¹ If the new temple represents the familiar image of the Christian congregation, it is difficult to see why the Jerusalem temple would first have to be destroyed or to conceive of Mark implying that this spiritual temple was not built until after the year A.D. 70.² On the one hand, it is impossible to interpret the temple in the second half of the saying differently from the first half, where it refers to the physical Jerusalem temple. Yet, on the other hand, it seems clear that Mark at least did intend to refer to the Christian community.³ This contradiction is part of the tension resulting from the double use to which the saying had been put in its transmission.

Before we can determine the sense in which Jesus might have said these words, we have to answer three questions. The first concerns his attitude to the cult, not only in the new aeon but also in the present. The question is whether or not the characterization of Goguel is accurate that Jesus "n'a pas conçu l'idée d'une religion sans culte," and that therefore, "il a nécessairement dû envisager l'établissement, aux temps messianiques, d'un sanctuaire nouveau."⁴ This will be examined in section 1, and since we can proceed only by implication, the attitudes of the early church to the temple cult must also be presented

The second question deals with the first half of the saying Mk 14:58, concerning the destruction of the Jerusalem temple. We shall try to establish a background for such a saying in Jewish apocalyptic and the viewpoint of the early church, and then on the basis of this background and Jesus' attitude to the cult developed in section 1, seek to determine whether or not Jesus is likely to have said he would destroy the temple made with hands. Finally, section 3 will deal with the second half of the saying Mk 14:58, investigating the background in the Jewish tradition and the teaching of the early church concerning the spiritual temple, to determine whether or not Jesus is likely to have said that he would build a new temple not made with hands. Basic to both discussions will be the question of the temple cult in the gospels, to which we now turn.

¹ D. Plooij, "Jesus and the Temple," *ExTimes* 42 (1930-31), 36-40.

² Cf. Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 101, n. 46; Goguel, "Parole," p. 128f.

³ Lohmeyer, *Markus*, p. 327; Klostermann, *Markus*, p. 155; Taylor, *Mark*, pp. 566f; Dodd, *Fourth Gospel*, pp. 300ff; O. Cullmann, "L'opposition contre le temple de Jérusalem, motif commun de la théologie johannique et du monde ambiant," *NTS* 5 (1959), 157-173, p. 167; *Petrus*, p. 223; Oepke, *Gottesvolk*, p. 169.

⁴ *Vie de Jésus*, p. 491.

I. THE TEMPLE CULT IN THE GOSPELS

The detailed study by Hans Wenschkewitz¹ remains for many still the most important work on this problem, even if his presentation is dependent in many respects on his own spiritualized conceptions and the Qumran finds have rendered much of his work obsolete. Wenschkewitz treats the question of Jesus' attitude to the cult as a special case of his attitude to the law as a whole, which, following Schmitz, he understands as at once a "conservatism" and a "radicalism."² To be sure, in the course of his investigation Wenschkewitz is several times found to qualify this apriori. At about the same time, Branscomb³ stated the same position in the Anglo-Saxon world and it has become quite general. It is, however, questionable whether Mt 5:18 ("not one jot or tittle") can carry so much weight and even more whether the temple cult is to be seen only as a subdivision of the law. E. Lohmeyer, on the other hand, has not been misled by the supposed subordination of the cult to the law, and he has come to quite different conclusions.⁴ He has tried to show the basic opposition of Jesus to the cult, at least in the Gospels of Matthew and Mark. The majority view, however, remains that of Schmitz and Wenschkewitz. In view of the unmistakable anti-cultic references, one is forced to postulate a dialectic of Jesus and the early church which will unite the anti-cultic references with Jesus' loyalty to the law. Typical is the frequently cited statement of Schrenk,⁵ "Der ganze synoptische Aufriss rechnet bei Jesus immer mit beidem: mit der Bejahung des Tempeldienstes als des von Gott bestimmten Weges der Verehrung Gottes und mit der Überlegenheit des Christus über den Tempel." We shall begin with the second half of this statement and try to demonstrate a definite anti-cultic polemic in the tradition lying behind the gospel

¹ *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe: Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament*, Angelos-Beiheft 4, Leipzig, 1932.

² *Spiritualisierung*, p. 89, quoting O. Schmitz, *Die Opferanschauungen des späteren Judentums und die Opferaussagen des Neuen Testaments*, Tübingen, 1910, p. 197.

³ B. H. Branscomb, *The Teachings of Jesus*, New York, 1931, pp. 303-319; *Jesus and the Law of Moses*, New York, 1930, p. 114.

⁴ Most completely in *Kultus und Evangelium*, Göttingen, 1942. W. Schmauch has followed Lohmeyer's lead from a different standpoint in his investigation of *Orte der Offenbarung und der Offenbarungsort im Neuen Testament*, Berlin, 1956.

⁵ *TWNT*, III, 241f, in Sperrdruck.

according to Mark. Then we shall examine the evidence behind the first half of the statement, not only in the witness of several gospel passages to Jesus but also in the actual practice of the Jerusalem church as far as this can be determined. Only at the end of our investigation will we be able to conjecture what Jesus' own attitude must have been.

Lohmeyer¹ maintains that only three sections in Mark are concerned with cultic questions: 1:20-3:6; 7:1-23; 11:1-15:40. That there is otherwise little interest shown in the Jerusalem cult should not surprise us, for the gospel, even if it uses traditions of the Aramaic speaking Jerusalem congregation, was written in Greek, presumably largely for Gentile readers. Indeed, Lohmeyer's list is undoubtedly much too encompassing. What interests us here is the coincidence that Lohmeyer's list agrees very closely with a list of the controversy stories which Albertz discovered in Mark 2:1-3:6; 11:15-17, 27-33; 12:13-37. It is to this collection that we now turn.

It is commonly recognized that Mark 2:1-3:6 is a pre-Markan collection of controversy stories.² The purpose of the collection as a whole was to explain the reason for Jesus' death, to answer the question of Jewish hostility, a problem which could have arisen only in a Jewish-Christian environment. The purpose of the individual stories was to provide authoritative answers to concrete problems of the Jewish-Christian church in controversies with their non-Christian neighbors: the church's claim to forgive sins, table fellowship with the cultically unclean, fasting, and keeping the Sabbath. We have here an important witness to the position of the early church in those practices which were a matter of controversy between Christians and Jews.

A second group of controversy stories is found in Mark 11-12.³ D. Daube has shown that the questions concerning tribute to Caesar, the resurrection, the great commandment, and David's son correspond to a Rabbinic pattern of four questions and answers,⁴ a

¹ *Kultus*, chap. II.

² First developed by M. Albertz, *Die synoptische Streitgespräche*, Berlin, 1921, pp. 5-16. Cf. M. Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*, London, 1934, p. 219; Lohmeyer, *Markus*, p. 49; Taylor, *Mark*, pp. 91f; W. L. Knox, *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels*, Vol. I, Cambridge, 1953, pp. 8ff; F. W. Beare, *The Earliest Records of Jesus*, Nashville, 1962, p. 70.

³ Albertz, pp. 16-36; Taylor, p. 101; Beare, p. 211.

⁴ D. Daube, "Four Types of Question," *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, London, 1956, pp. 158-169.

subtlety which is a strong indication of a pre-Markan arrangement. It may be that we can go further, and show that if these two collections did not at one time form a unity, at least they stem from the same tradition. It is extraordinary that the Herodians should be mentioned in both 3:6 and 12:13 as being in alliance with the Pharisees, a confederation which would have been historically possible only during the reign of Herod Agrippa.¹ We have then in these two groups of controversy stories an exceedingly important witness to the early church, since they form a collection (or two collections) put together as early as the years 40-44 A.D. They represent our primary source in discussing the cultic attitudes of the earliest church.

The controversy story proper in the story of the healing of the paralytic (Mk 2:1-12) lies in the verses 5b-10a concerning the question of forgiveness.² "Who can forgive sins but God alone?" is the attitude common to all of Judaism,³ but he has graciously given in the Torah the way by which he forgives: on the basis of previous repentance through the daily and private sacrifices and especially through the rites of the Day of Atonement. But here stands a layman in the place of the whole sacrificial system when he claims for himself the authority not only to heal, but also to mediate forgiveness; or more, not only to mediate like the cult, but in God's place to forgive. Here is more than the temple. One cannot, of course, press the argumentation to mean that the power to heal necessarily includes the power to forgive. The healing is a sign and in no sense a proof. The only "proof" that can be given for Jesus' authority is the scriptural one, namely, that the Son of Man "has been given authority and glory and kingdom" (Dn 7:14). This authority has been given according to Mt 28:18 on the basis of Jesus' death and exaltation. Further, the strange phrase about the Son of Man having authority *on earth* seems to suggest a contrast

¹ Cf. B. W. Bacon, "Pharisees and Herodians in Mark," *JBL* 39 (1920), 102-112. He is followed by Lohmeyer, *Markus*, p. 67, n. 2; Knox, *Sources*, p. 8; P. Winter, *On the Trial of Jesus*, Berlin, 1961, p. 128. Matthew and Luke could not understand these Herodians and so in all but one case omitted them. It is extraordinary how Bultmann too ignores them: "die Gegner . . . sind erst in dem sekundären Vers (Mk 3:) 6 als die Pharisäer (sic!) bestimmt worden" (*syn. Trad.*, p. 54).

² So Bultmann, *syn. Trad.*, p. 12ff, and most others.

³ Cf. G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, Vol. I, p. 535. According to Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, I, 495, it is not said even of the Messiah that he could forgive sins.

to the exalted Son of Man in heaven. The Son of Man here must then refer to the body of Christ the Church, to whom has been given the authority to forgive (Jn 20:22f, Mt 16:19; 18:18), as is shown by the editorial modification of Mt 9:8, "God has given such authority to *men*."¹ It is after all only with such an implication that the controversy story would serve to answer a problem of the transmitting congregation vis-à-vis Judaism. As such the story clearly reflects the early Christian community, making claims which put it in competition with and in opposition to the temple cult.

The cultic background of the story of Jesus eating with tax-collectors and sinners, Mk 2:15-17, is indirect. The program of the Pharisees was to eat, pray, and study in a condition of Levitical purity, voluntarily to submit themselves as laymen to regulations originally referring only to the priests.² The question of cleanness comes to the fore especially in the matter of table fellowship, and, therefore, the Gentile mission of the Church is bound up with this question of Levitical purity.³ The Pharisees, even those within the Church (Ac 11:3), accused the early Christians of having profaned themselves by eating with the unclean, thereby rendering themselves ineligible for participation in the temple cult. The answer given by this story, that Jesus has come to call the sinners, to invite them to eat with him,⁴ contains distinctively cultic claims. The unclean come to Jesus, not to the temple, for the banquet, and they are purified by him, not by sacrifice, to enable them to take part in it. The whole distinction between clean and unclean, as well as all cultic means of removing uncleanness, are here radically abolished. Whether or not this was Jesus' intention, it is definitely the point of this story. That we have not read too much cultic presupposition into the story is shown by the version in Matthew, where in 9:13 the saying, "I desire mercy and not sacrifice" (Hos 6:6) is cited.

¹ Aside from the collective interpretation of the Son of Man begun by T. W. Manson, cf. Bultmann, *syn. Trad.*, p. 13f.

² Cf. below, pp. 131f.

³ Cf. Gal 2:12; Acts 10-11. The connection there made between unclean men and unclean food is therefore not as absurd as Haenchen, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 307, thinks.

⁴ What is meant is undoubtedly the messianic banquet; cf. J. Jeremias, *Jesus' Promise to the Nations*, London, 1958, pp. 59ff. Lohmeyer, *Markus*, p. 56, compares the *καλεῖν* in the parables of the banquet, e.g. Mt 22:3. That Luke understands the calling as "to repentance" shows that he is thinking not of the eschatological banquet but of the conversion-agape; cf. B. Reicke, *Diakonie, Festfreude und Zelos*, Uppsala, 1951, pp. 215ff.

This can only mean in this context that God desires the mercy shown by Jesus when he calls the unclean to himself, and not the sacrifices which can only be carried out by participants who are in a state of Levitical purity. For Jesus has come to call the unclean. The Pharisees should learn from Jesus' action the meaning of the Hosea citation: however it was originally meant, now it has become an exclusive opposition between Jesus and the temple.

The controversy story Mk 2:18-20 concerning fasting does not really have anything to do with the temple cult.¹ The point of the story, differing from Mt 6:16ff which tells the Church how to fast, is to justify the complete non-fasting of early Christians,² and in this sense only could be called anti-cultic. It is perhaps significant that Mark has added the sayings about old and new at this point, for whatever they originally meant, they express quite well the attitude of these controversy stories to all questions of the old religion.

The argumentation in the story of the disciples plucking grain on the Sabbath Mk 2:23-28 is very confused. What does the Sabbath have to do with David's action in the temple (the shrine of the ark)? We must begin once more with the form critical insight that the purpose of this story is to justify the actual Sabbath freedom of the early Church ("his disciples"). We must further give full force to

¹ Only if the assumption of S. Zeitlin, *Who Crucified Jesus?*, is true, that the fast in question was one of the four days commemorating the destruction of the first temple, would there be a connection with the temple cult: namely that there is no need to fast, for a new and better temple is here; cf. Zech 8:19.

² As difficult as Vs 20 is, it cannot mean to restrict non-fasting to the lifetime of Jesus, so that the point of the story would then be to justify the later fasting practice of the church, as Bultmann, *syn. Trad.*, p. 17f; Lohmeyer, *Markus*, p. 60; Jeremias, *TWNT*, IV, 1096, maintain. Quite aside from form-critical considerations which show that it was not the practice of Jesus but that of the church which is at issue ("your disciples"! Vs 18b), H. J. Ebeling, "Die Fastenfrage (Mark 2.18-22)," *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 108 (1937-38), 387-396, points out that the early church was by no means living in a time of mourning when their Lord was taken from them. To refer the expression "in that day" to the practice of fasting on Good Friday (Lohmeyer) is impossible, for this practice cannot be traced earlier than Irenaeus (Eusebius, H.E. V, xxiv, 12) and weekly fasting came even later (Did 8:1 refers to *two* days per week). On the difficulties of referring this saying to any known practice of the church, cf. K. Th. Schäfer, "... und dann werden sie fasten, an jenem Tage' (Mk 2, 20 und Par)," *Synoptische Studien A. Wikenhauser dargebracht*, München, 1953, pp. 124-147. In view of the eschatological associations of "in that day" (= *ביום ההוא*), perhaps the best understanding would be that they would not fast until the day of judgment, i.e. never (cf. perhaps Mt 5:18, "till heaven and earth pass away").

the ὥστε which shows that the last sentence "so the Son of Man is lord also of the Sabbath," is meant to be the conclusion of a logical demonstration. If the story is to fulfill its purpose this must mean that the "Son of Man" is the Church as well as Jesus, just as in 2:10, although, of course, the freedom of the Church is grounded in the freedom of her Lord. But how does this freedom of Jesus follow from the story about David?

The comparison begins with the statement of Dn 7:14 that the Son of Man was given the kingdom by God. David too received a kingdom from God, but the kingdom of the Son of Man is incomparably greater. According to the Midrash,¹ it was on a Sabbath that David ate the bread of the presence and gave it to his followers, without being reprimanded for it in the text of 1 Sm 21:1-7. Now if this was allowed for the lord of the kingdom of Israel, how much more must it be allowed for the Lord of the whole creation, who according to Ps 110 is also David's Lord. "Therefore, the Son of Man is Lord also (καί) of the Sabbath." This argument is, however, not quite satisfying, for the David story really concerns the eating of the bread of the presence, "which it is not lawful for any but the priests to eat," which seems much more important than the unexpressed incidental fact that it occurred on the Sabbath. Has the story been secondarily applied to the Sabbath, whereas originally it referred to the temple and the Church eating bread like the priests the temple bread? Is it possible that the reaping itself has a cultic significance?² Or, is one member of the thought process simply presupposed, namely, that the temple halacha is more important than the Sabbath halacha, so that the point would be: when David could set aside the temple law, how much more does his Lord stand over the less important Sabbath law, a double Qal wahomer? All of this is simply not stated in the Markan story, which makes no sense as it now stands.³

¹ Cf. Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, I, 618f, and especially B. Marmorstein, "Jesu Gang durch die Saatfelder," *Angelos* 3 (1930), 111-120, who points out how essential this unexpressed circumstance is to the argument. This midrashic assumption was perhaps suggested by the fact that the bread of the presence was renewed on the table on the Sabbath (Lev 24:5-9).

² "Moreover the reaping overrides the Sabbath" (Men 10:9). What is meant is the reaping of the first fruits of the harvest, Lev 23:10, on the second day of Passover even if it fell on a Sabbath. Is the thought behind the action of the disciples that they are priests in the new temple? In any case they are not motivated by hunger, contra Bultmann, *syn. Trad.*, p. 14.

³ Vs 27 brings a second argument, completely independent of the David

The version in Mt 12:1-8 is in any case not a distortion of Mark, but rather makes clear what Mark only presupposes and thus has better expressed the original meaning of the story. Here we find the link which was missing in Mark. The temple service allows work on the Sabbath (Num 28:9f, cf. Jub 50:10f), it "overrides" the Sabbath (Vs 5); Jesus and his Church¹ are more than the temple (Vs 6), and therefore they all the more override the Sabbath, are lord of the Sabbath. The halachic argument of Matthew is superior to the haggadic one of Mark,² although both argue for the freedom of Jesus and his followers over the Sabbath in terms of the temple cult. The quotation from Hos 6:6, "I desire mercy and not sacrifice," could in itself mean only that mercy is more important than sacrifice, which retains a subordinate significance. It is not the quotation as such but the manner of its use by Matthew which gives it here as in 9:13 a clearly anti-cultic meaning.³

As the healing of the man with the withered hand is not directly pertinent to our present investigation, we now turn to the second collection of controversy stories in Mark 11-12. The interpretation of the cleansing of the temple has been made especially complicated for us by the evangelists, who for their part attempted to give the story a particular interpretation by minor additions and by the context in which they have placed it. Further, a major source of misunderstanding is to be found in the usual designation "*cleansing*

story. When, according to a generally recognized proverb (Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, II, 5), the Sabbath was made for man, how much more for the Son of Man. This second argument is however weak and disturbs the progression of the first and was therefore omitted by Matthew and Luke. When we note in addition that it is lacking or incomplete in DitWsyr³, in four of Streeter's five great text types, it must be seriously considered that the verse is altogether a later addition to the text of Mark.

¹ That the neuter *μεῖζον* refers to the kingdom, cf. T. W. Manson, *The Mission and Message of Jesus*, New York, 1938, p. 479, although there is little difference in meaning, for the church understood the kingdom to be embodied in Jesus. Again, the sense of the controversy requires the collective interpretation, for it is the "guiltless" (plural, Vs 7) who are accused and then justified.

² Cf. Daube, *NT and Rabbinic Judaism*, pp. 67ff; and R. Hummel, *Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum im Matthäusevangelium*, München, 1963, pp. 40ff.

³ Cf. W. O. E. Oesterley, "Temple", *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, II, 1908, pp. 708-713; Wenschkewitz, *Spiritualisierung*, pp. 94ff; Lohmeyer, *Kultus*, pp. 27, 84f; Cole, *New Temple*, pp. 12f. On the anti-cultic implications of Jesus' attitude to the Sabbath, cf. W. Rordorf, *Der Sonntag*, Zürich, 1962, p. 114.

of the temple", which is not warranted by the text at all and which presupposes an interpretation derived from Mal 3:1.¹ The first step in understanding the story lies in the discovery by Albertz that Mark 11-12 contains a collection of controversy stories: a) the cleansing of the temple together with the question of authority Mk 11:15-17, 27-33, b) tribute to Caesar Mk 12:13-17, c) the resurrection Mk 12:18-27, d) the great commandment Mk 12:28-34, and e) David's son Mk 12:35-37. Different from the collection previously discussed Mk 2:1-3:6, it is here not so much a matter of the polemic of the early church — the disciples are not even mentioned — as of vehement and often astounding comment by Jesus on various burning issues of his own day. Although they were given form by the early church, we undoubtedly come closer to the historical Jesus in these five controversy stories than in any other narratives of the synoptic tradition. Because of Jesus' majestic isolation from all contemporary Jewish factions, this collection was eminently suitable as an introduction to the passion story, even if the stories themselves contain no chronological indications; Mark had only to add a few verses, 11:18f, 12:12, to make the connection explicit.

Mark also wrote at a time when the failure of Israel as a whole to respond to the gospel and the inevitability of the Roman war were obvious to all and agonizing for the Jewish-Christian church. As an attempt to explain these tragic events, he therefore inserted the parable of the wicked tenants 12:1-11, the sayings against the Pharisees 12:38-40,² and the cursing of the fig-tree 11:12-14, 20-25. Although these additions will be discussed separately, it is important now to show how they have influenced Mark's version of the cleansing of the temple. The story of the entry into Jerusalem Mk 11:1-11 ended in the temple, and it would have been appropriate to connect the story of the cleansing at this point, as Matthew has done.³ More important is the observation that the question about authority was once an integral part of the story of the cleansing

¹ Thus J. W. Bowman, *The Religion of Maturity*, 1948, pp. 122ff, interprets.

² It is possible but not likely that these sayings provided the conclusion to the collection of controversy stories, as Albertz, *Streitgespräche*, pp. 16ff, maintained.

³ This is not to say that the two were once organically combined as part of the same story of enthronement and cult-renewal, as Jeremias, *Weltvollender*, pp. 35ff, would have it, for as we shall see the cleansing story has nothing to do with reforming the cult.

of the temple, for a) only then could one speak of a controversy story, b) also Jn 2:13ff 18ff combines the two as part of a single tradition, and c) the question about authority is not self-contained, since the $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ in Vs 28 of necessity refers back to a concrete situation. We have now to ask why Mark wanted so much to enclose the cleansing of the temple between the two halves of the story of the cursing of the fig-tree that he interrupted the original connection of the former.¹

An answer is suggested by a consideration once more of the dark hour in which this gospel was written. The Messiah of Israel had come and in spite of his legitimization by resurrection, Israel as a whole had not responded to him. Not only was the mission of the Jerusalem church discouraging in its results, but now the hopeless war against Rome was underway, and the promises of the Old Testament seemed forfeited. Some explanation had to be found for this outcome of the most recent past. In such a situation the fig-tree must have had a symbolic meaning for Mark, whatever the origin of this puzzling story is, for otherwise he would not have weaved it so carefully into his story shortly before the passion. The fig-tree represents Israel, as in the parable of Luke 13:6-9.² The tree had not borne fruit, as the version in Luke still hoped, and now it is cursed. When Peter sees on the next day that the fig-tree was withered, this is but a description of the actual situation of Israel in the eyes of the evangelist. When we take this symbolic understanding of Mark into consideration, then we understand why the following isolated sayings on faith, prayer, and forgiveness should have been added at just this point. We can understand the hopelessness of Peter, apostle to the circumcized, and Jesus' answer, "Have faith in God". When it is not possible for the Gentiles to begin their

¹ It seems to be a matter of conscious literary technique when Mark divides one pericope to insert another, for it is quite frequent in his gospel. The enclosed story receives thereby through its context, the divided pericope, a particular interpretation, as in the story of the woman with the flow of blood, Mk 5:25-34, where the surrounding story of the raising of Jairus' daughter, Mk 5:21-24, 35-43, emphasizes the role of faith to offset what was before rather a magical healing by contact. Or it might be that it is the surrounding story that is interpreted by the insert: cf. the light that Mk 14:3-9 throws on 14:1-2, 10-12, or Mk 3:22-30 on 3:20-21, 31-35. This technique was first commented on by E. von Dobschütz, "Zur Erzählungskunst des Markus," *ZNW* 27 (1928), 193-198, esp. pp. 197f.

² The connection with the parable of Luke 13 is emphasized by Taylor, *Mark*, p. 459, and Knox, *Sources*, I, p. 8of.

pilgrimage to Mount Zion, then Zion will go to the Gentiles. This is of course not the meaning of the saying about faith which can move mountains as this is found in Q (Mt 17:20 = Lk 17:6, cf. 1 Cor 13:2), but explains the differences in the Markan version as well as its being inserted at just this point. It is in this light that Mark also wants the cleansing of the temple to be understood.¹ He sees the cleansing of the temple as a proleptic sign of its destruction.

If Mark really understood the story as referring to the destruction of the temple, it remains to be seen if such an understanding has left its mark on the text itself as well as on the context. We can begin with the question of why Matthew and Luke have omitted the words "for all the nations" from the Isaiah citation. It is frequently to be observed in a synoptic comparison how the later gospels smooth over rather artless connections in Mark ("Nähte glätten"), omitting superfluous words and making a more unified narrative style. Traces of an earlier understanding in the tradition are only gradually removed, for whereas Matthew and Luke know a word or phrase *only* in the connection of Mark's gospel, Mark himself sees the phrase *also* in the form of the tradition in which it came to him.² Since it is difficult to understand why Matthew or Luke would find the words "for all the nations" objectionable,³ we might have here to do with just such a case. The present Markan text has to do with the opposition between "house of prayer" and "den of robbers", and the nations are in fact rather superfluous and even obscure the intended contrast.⁴ Matthew and Luke were then only improving Mark's story by omitting them, and we should see in the nations a trace of a pre-Markan understanding, while the

¹ "Das, was nun im Tempel geschah, und Jesu Tat am Baum erläutern sich gegenseitig," A. Schlatter, *Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament*, 2 *Die Evangelien nach Markus und Lukas*, Stuttgart, 1947, p. 116.

² In a chain of tradition A — B — C, details from B which C modifies or eliminates because not in accord with the general tenor of B must have been very important in A, or B would not have kept them in the first place. Thus paradoxically what is least important for C was the most important for A. (There is an analogy for B keeping details from A. Films made from novels often seem to have scenes or characters which are superfluous to the story as portrayed on the screen; they are holdovers from the longer novel, in which connection they had real reason for existence).

³ That they should have omitted these words after A.D. 70 because the nations had destroyed their own temple, so Manson, *Jesus and the Non-Jews*, London, 1955, p. 12, seems quite far-fetched.

⁴ Cf. J. Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Marci*, 1903, p. 97.

opposition house of prayer / den of robbers, Vs 17b, is a conception introduced for the first time by Mark. This is supported also by a consideration of the phrase *σπήλαιον ληστῶν*, which comes from Jer 7:11, where it is a question of the destruction of the temple, and which in its present context probably should be translated "Zealot stronghold".¹ A reference to the Zealots may well have suggested itself to Mark at this point because Jesus' action was so understood by the people of Jerusalem, as we shall see. In the context of Mark, however, the saying refers clearly to the later occupation of the temple by the Zealots during the war with Rome (B.J. IV, 151), and because of this predicts its coming destruction. Vs 17b "but you have made it a Zealot stronghold" was therefore not part of the original story, to which we now turn.

The action of Jesus here reported is strange enough. That he would not allow anyone to carry a vessel (*σκεῦος*) through the temple area goes beyond even the regulations of the Pharisees, for the prohibition in Ber 9:5 usually referred to in this connection² speaks of staff, sandals, wallet, and dust on the feet but does not specifically mention a vessel at all. Also one does not see why the sellers of sacrificial animals and money changers should be driven out, for that they overcharged and were in this sense thieves is not indicated by a single word, especially not the word *ληστής*. Any interruption of their activities was at the most temporary and probably not even very extensive, for there is no action by the temple police and no such tumultuous scene as that of Acts 21:31ff. In contrast to the manner in which the Essenes would have cleansed the temple, beginning with the High Priest and continuing with a reform of the whole cult, Jesus cannot be seen here as a religious reformer, cleansing the temple of abuses.³ Jesus' action can best be under-

¹ So G. W. Buchanan, "Mark 11.15-19: Brigands in the Temple", *H.U.C.A.* XXX (1959), pp. 169-177, after a careful study of *ληστής* and *κλέπτης* in the NT, OT, and Josephus. He concludes (p. 176) that the Sitz im Leben of this phrase must be in the years 68-70 A.D. Rengstorff (*TWNT*, IV, 262ff) concludes that the word refers to the Zealots everywhere in the NT except 2 Cor 11:26 and in this passage, but he gives no valid reason for making an exception here. In any case the word, like the Heb פִּרְיָץ, does not mean thief but rather man of violence, murderer, brigand, bandit. It is therefore not possible to refer the expression to dishonest Temple sellers, as Taylor, *Mark*, p. 463, still attempts to do.

² Klostermann, *Mark*, p. 131, also cites Josephus, *c. Ap.* II, 106, but this clearly refers to carrying vessels into the *ναόν*, not through the *ιερόν* as is the case in Mark.

³ The story is understood as a reformation of the cult by Goguel, Parole,

stood as an acted parable, a symbolic action¹ which is important not in itself but in what it signifies and which collects an audience for the following interpretation. The action would on the one hand show Jesus' zeal (cf. Ps 69:10 cited in Jn 2:17) and thus enhance his popularity with revolutionary circles, leading to the tribute-money question, and on the other increase the suspicions of the conservative circles which ultimately led to his condemnation as a Zealot. The motive for this particular action is undoubtedly to be found in Zech 14:21, where it is said that on the eschatological day of the coming of the Gentiles to Mount Zion 1. "every vessel in Jerusalem and Judah shall be sacred to the Lord of hosts" and 2. "there shall no longer be a trader (כוער) in the house of the Lord of hosts on that day".²

"And he taught" Vs 17,³ but as usual Mark does not tell us what Jesus taught but gives us only the text of his midrash. It is probable that the controversy story once led directly from Jesus' action to the question of authority, and that the teaching which in fact accompanied the action was based on Zechariah 14.⁴ Nevertheless the quotation of Is 56:7 at this point undoubtedly correctly indicates the tenor of Jesus' teaching and is of great importance for understanding the original meaning of his action. Lohmeyer has shown

p. 122ff, Schrenk, *TWNT*, III, 243, Taylor, *Mark*, p. 463. Lohmeyer, *Mark*, p. 236, thinks that the reform was so radical as to make a synagogue out of the temple, but it would be better not to speak of reform at all (cf. *Kultus*, p. 47).

¹ So Lohmeyer, *Kultus*, p. 44ff, Lightfoot, *The Gospel Message of St. Mark*, 1950, p. 68f. J. S. Kennard, *Jesus in the Temple*, speaks appropriately of a "popular gesture."

² So very convincingly C. Roth, "The Cleansing of the Temple and Zechariah XIV 21", *NT* 4 (1960), pp. 174-181. He points out that the Zealots on the other hand would have interpreted the ambiguous expression as "Canaanite", as part of their demand that the temple be cleansed of all heathen contact. On the significance of Zech 14 for this part of Mark, cf. R. M. Grant, "The Coming of the Kingdom", *JBL* 67 (1948), pp. 297-303.

³ The disconnected καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς shows perhaps that here an isolated saying has been added, cf. Goguel, *Parole*, p. 123, Bultmann, *syn Trad.*, p. 36. It is worth considering that the words καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς in Mark are perhaps an indication of the use of a Redequelle where the individual logia were regularly introduced in a fashion similar to the Gospel of Thomas; cf. Mk 2:27f; 4:2, 9, 11, 13, 21, 24, 26, 30; 7:14; 8:34; 9:1, 37; 10:11; 12:38. Could the title of such a collection have been ἡ διδασχὴ 'Ιησοῦ, cf. 4:2; 12:38?

⁴ John 2:14ff, while it maintains the connection of Jesus' action in the temple with the question on authority and while the connection with Zech 14 is even clearer than in Mark, knows nothing of a quotation from Isaiah but brings instead a testimony from Ps 69.

the way to a correct interpretation in his statement: "In der Reinigung des Vorhofs handelt es sich also nur mittelbar um ein Problem des bestehenden jüdischen Temples, unmittelbar aber um das Problem der 'heidnischen Völker'".¹ Lohmeyer however puts too much emphasis on the fact that the action occurred in the so-called "Court of the Gentiles", for this designation and the ideas it suggests were unknown in antiquity.² Old Testament texts referring to Gentiles in the temple mean of course the whole temple, and the idea in the back of many minds has only to be stated to be seen in its absurdity, namely that the commotion and noise of the outer court had to be suppressed so the Gentiles could pray there in peace, while the Israelites would offer sacrifice by themselves as before.³ Jesus refers to the eschatological coming of the Gentiles to the eschatological "temple", under quite transformed conditions.⁴

We have seen that the original opposition was not house of prayer / den of robbers, and yet an opposition between eschatological prophecy and present conditions is definitely implied: it can be no other than house of prayer for the nations / house of sacrifice for Israel.⁵ Once again we must recall that Jesus' symbolic action occurs in the outer court, far from priests and sacrifices and the

¹ "Die Reinigung des Tempels", *ThBl* 20 (1941), Cols 257-264, quotation Col 261.

² The outer court is called in Hebrew הַר הַבַּיִת (cf. Bik 3:4, Pes 5:5ff, Shek 7:2f, Sanh 11:2) and by Josephus πρῶτον ἱερόν (B.J. V, 195) ἑξῶθεν ἱερόν (B.J. IV, 313) τὸ κατω ἱερόν (B.J. V, 187) πρώτος περίβολος (B.J. IV, 204). I have not been able to trace the origin of the designation "court of the Gentiles", but that it is modern is stated also by Allen Wikgren in the Loeb edition of Josephus, Vol. VIII (1963), p. 202, note b. That the Gentiles may enter the outer court is occasionally mentioned, but only in a negative sense: that they may not pass the sore into the inner courts under penalty of death, cf. B.J. V, 194; VI, 124f; Ant XV, 417; Acts 21:26ff and the warning inscription found by Clermont-Ganneau. An excellent discussion of this prohibition is E. J. Bickerman, "The Warning Inscription of Herod's Temple", *JQR* 37 (1946-47), p. 387-405.

³ So explicitly in B. Weiss, *Die Evangelien des Markus und des Lukas*, 1901, p. 178, and strangely still in F. V. Filson, *A New Testament History*, 1964, p. 129: "The confusion and din of bargaining and dispute prevented quiet worship by any Gentiles who came to the temple for worship."

⁴ That it is a question of the eschatological temple has been strongly maintained by Lohmeyer, *Mk*, p. 237; Reinigung, p. 257ff; *Kultus*, p. 47ff. Cf. Lightfoot, *Mk*, p. 63-66, Manson, *Jesus and the Non-Jews*, p. 11f, Sjöberg, *Church*, p. 77f, Kümmel, *Verheissung*, p. 111.

⁵ Also Oesterley, *DCG*, II, p. 713, sees an anti-cultic tendency in this story. The opposition is of course not the modern distinction between spiritual prayer and material sacrifice, as Oesterley (p. 712) but also Wenschkewitz, p. 90, and Delling, p. 17, think.

temple building—in no sense can he be said to have “cleansed the temple”, not even for the future worship of the Gentiles. In the eschaton the Gentiles will come not to the outer court only but to the eschatological temple, which will be called a house of prayer and where there will be no more sacrifice.¹ Jesus ignores the empirical temple completely, for the contrast is only implicit, but it is easy to see why Mark would have added the saying about the den of robbers and thus referred also to the destruction of the temple, and why John has included the temple saying in the framework of the cleansing story.

The anti-cultic implications of Jesus' action in the temple are confirmed by a consideration of the controversy story concerning Jesus' authority to do “this”, Mk 11:27-33. It is perhaps significant that it should be representatives of the temple² who feel threatened (cf. 12:12) and so ask about Jesus' authority. He replies in a familiar Rabbinic manner by a counter-question concerning the baptism of John. But what does John's baptism have to do with Jesus' action in the temple?³ John had appeared in the desert, and far from leading the people to the temple, the inhabitants of Jerusalem came to him (Mk 1:5). There he preached “a repentance-baptism leading toward (εἰς) the forgiveness of sins” (1:4). Of course the words quoted here have been given a specifically Christian formulation,⁴ and it is most improbable that John himself would have so designated his baptism. Nevertheless it was meant to prepare a purified and repentant people for the advent of the coming one, completely by-passing the rites of the temple. Purification through fire would result not from the fire of sacrifice but with the fiery baptism of him who is to come, and for the present John's baptism with water supplants all temple sacrifice.⁵ If John had authority “from heaven”

¹ This of course goes beyond the statement of Is 56:7, which speaks in the first half of the verse of the sacrifice of the Gentiles. Nevertheless there is good reason why the whole verse is not cited.

² That the “elders” were mostly Sadducees, cf. Josephus, B.J. II, 411, and Jeremias, *Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu*, 1958², IIB, p. 90. It is of course most improbable that the Sanhedrin should be meant here.

³ It is once more E. Lohmeyer, *Mk* p. 242f, who has the merit of insisting that there must be more than a formal connection.

⁴ Cf. Acts 2:38. It is significant that Mt should have omitted the words “for forgiveness of sins” from his account of the Baptist only to insert them at the last supper, Mt 26:28.

⁵ That John's baptism was meant as a surrogate for sacrifice, cf. Lohmeyer, *Das Urchristentum. I Johannes der Täufer*, esp. pp. 145-157, and cf. below, pp. 138f.

so to by-pass the temple and all expiation by sacrifice, then this same authority lay behind Jesus' actions contrasting house of prayer for the nations and house of sacrifice for Israel. Jesus' opponents seem to have recognized quite clearly the anti-cultic implications both of his present actions and of John's baptism.

The controversies concerning tribute to Caesar (Mk 12:13-17) and the resurrection (12:18-27), except that they show that Jesus agreed neither with the Zealots nor with the Sadducees, have nothing to do with cultic matters. The pericope concerning the great commandment, Mk 12:28-34, on the other hand, has added an anti-cultic reference even where it does not belong: the commandment to love is "much more than all burnt offerings and sacrifices" (33b). The question concerning the greatest commandment has of course nothing to do with sacrifice, as Matthew and Luke recognized in omitting these verses. This gratuitous disparagement of sacrifice was however not first included by Mark but belongs to an early stage in the transmission of the material, as the friendly relationship between Jesus and the scribe shows.¹ Even if this polemic probably did not figure in the original discussion of Jesus, it represents an important corollary drawn by the earliest congregation from the great commandment (cf. Mt 9:13; 12:6).

The pericope concerning David's son, Mk 12:35-37, is so terse that it is very difficult to interpret. "How do the scribes say that the *χριστός* is the son of David?" Since by definition the Messiah is the son of David,² it seems that we must understand the "Anointed" in a general sense. Jesus cites the beginning of Ps 110 to show that David speaks of a certain figure as Lord, a figure who therefore cannot be his son. Unfortunately the story does not indicate who this "Anointed" is if it is not the Messiah ben David. It is possible that the tradition meant the anointed priest "after the order of Melchizedek" from Vs 4 of the Psalm, which would bring this pericope into line with the anti-cultic tendencies of the other con-

¹ The conclusion of G. Bornkamm, "Das Doppelgebot der Liebe", *Neutestamentliche Studien für R. Bultmann*, BZNW 21 (1954), pp. 85-93, that the clear anti-cultic tendency of Vs 32f points to a Hellenistic origin rests on false conceptions about the attitude of the Palestinian church.

² This is not made sufficiently clear by Cullmann, *Christologie*, p. 132f. His discussion of the passage is however much more to the point than that of Lohmeyer, *Galiläa und Jerusalem*, p. 93, who finds the Son of Man indicated in opposition to the Messiah, or that of Bultmann, *syn. Trad.*, p. 144, who reads a Son of God Christology into the passage.

troversy stories.¹ The story would also fit in very well with the situation of the Jerusalem church, and even of Jesus himself, for as we have learned from Qumran the relative status of the priestly and kingly Messiahs was a matter of controversy. Jesus lays claim to Ps 110 as a passage referring to the eschatological priest rather than to the king, in agreement with Qumran.² However, while this may very well have been the original point of the story, in its present form it is not possible to say with certainty what is really meant.

It is most significant that polemic against the temple cult should be found in precisely those sections of Mark which most probably stem from the Jerusalem church and which reflect actual controversies of this church. However, such polemic can also be found in other parts of Mark, perhaps most clearly in the story of the cleansing of a leper, Mk 1:40-45. This story has no connection with the preceeding Vs 16-39, which encompass the events of a single day, placed at the beginning to represent the "day of the manifestation of our Savior Jesus Christ."³ It serves rather as an introduction to the following controversy stories and may have been joined to them before it came to Mark.⁴ The story emphasizes very strongly not the healing (ἰᾶσθαι cf Lk 17:15) but the cultic purification of the leper (καθαρίζειν 1:40, 41, 42, καθαρισμός 1:44). The two concepts are clearly distinguished: 1. the leprosy left him, and 2. he was made clean (Vs 42), but the emphasis is on the making and declaring clean (טהר). The law made no provision for the healing of "leprosy" but only for the return to cultic purity when the disease had been healed by a physician or simply disappeared (Lev 13-14). This purification could only be declared by a priest and was dependent

¹ Cf. G. Friedrich, "Beobachtungen zur messianischen Hohepriestererwartung in den Synoptikern", *ZThK* 53 (1956), pp. 265-311, esp. pp. 286f., who finds a high priestly Christology also in many other parts of Mark. Cf. also W. Staerk, *Soter*, II, 1938, p. 27.

² For the superiority of the priestly over the kingly Messiah in Qumran, cf. especially 1QSa. Unfortunately Ps 110 is not cited in the Qumran literature published to date.

³ R. H. Lightfoot, *The Gospel Message of St. Mark*, 1950, p. 25. He thinks of the story of the leper as having programmatic significance here at the beginning, much like the wedding feast at Cana and the cleansing of the temple in Jn 2, and calls it an illustration of Rm 8:3 (p. 26). But the story is not about what the law can do in general but quite specifically is concerned with the problem of purification.

⁴ So Knox, *Sources*, p. 8; Beare, *Earliest Records*, p. 70; Burkill, *Mysterious Revelation*, pp. 37, 123ff.

on making the appropriate sacrifices (Neg 3:1). When here the leper is not only healed but cleansed, then the prescribed sacrifice no longer makes any sense. That the man is nevertheless told to go to the priest and offer his sacrifice does not contradict this, for Strathmann has conclusively shown that εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς must be translated "zum (Belästigungs-) Zeugnis gegen sie", i.e. the priests.¹ Since the priests never claimed to be able to cure leprosy and since there can be no question of the faith or disbelief in a Jesus they have never seen on the basis of a miraculous cure about which they are not told (41a),² this witness can only refer to the sacrifices. Jesus can (not only heal but) make clean, and the sacrifice the leper is told to make is therefore a witness against all purificatory sacrifice.³

The whole question of Levitical cleanness is of course a cultic one. The purpose of being in a state of cleanness is to enable one to participate in the temple sacrifices, but also the means whereby one becomes clean involve in most cases a sacrifice offered in the temple, along with a waiting period and purification usually with water. Whenever it is said that Jesus is able to make a person clean this is said in direct opposition to the sacrifices, as is exemplified in the story of the leper just discussed. It is the universal rule that while cleanness cannot be transmitted, uncleanness is always contagious by contact. It is then extremely significant that in the story just discussed it should be emphasized that Jesus touched the leper (Mk 1:41), and yet he did not become unclean, but on the contrary the leper was made clean. The same is true of the woman with a hemorrhage, whose Niddah has lasted twelve years, where the physical contact is strongly emphasized (Mk 5:27, 28, 30, 31).⁴ This tendency of Jesus confronting an unclean person without becoming himself unclean is brought out also in the story of the Gerasene demoniac, Mk 5:1ff, where the elements

¹ *TWNTIV*, 509. This usage prohibits the usual conception that the story is meant to show Jesus' loyalty to the (ceremonial) law, for it is strongly emphasized that the man has already been declared clean. Also in Lk 17:14 the lepers are declared clean before they go to the priests.

² The subject of Vs 45 is still Jesus; the story is therefore not comparable to 5:20; 7:36. Cf. Klostermann, *Mk*, p. 24.

³ Cf. Lohmeyer, *Kultus*, p. 34.

⁴ Contact is of course a motif in many healing stories, cf. Bultmann, *syn. Trad.* p. 237f. The point is that this traditional motif is especially emphasized in cases of uncleanness.

of uncleanness are piled one upon another: 1. it is Gentile territory, 2. he has an "unclean" spirit, and 3. he lives among the tombs. In this same connection lies the fact that demons are so often called "unclean spirits" in the early tradition.¹ Jesus as the Holy One of God (Mk 1:24) not only heals those who are possessed by driving out the demon but also purifies them of their uncleanness.²

Finally, we come to a series of sayings in Mark 7 which seem to abolish the whole distinction between clean and unclean. The controversy story Mk 7:1-2a, 5-8 is interesting first of all in the situation presupposed: that Jesus' disciples, i.e. the Palestinian church, were accustomed to ignore the Pharisaic regulations of washing to eat in a state of ritual purity. In itself this says no more than that the early Christians were not Pharisees, and it is difficult to see how a controversy could have arisen unless further implications were involved. There is nothing controversial about eating with unwashed hands, unless the Christians thereby made the claim that they were nevertheless eating in a state of purity, a state brought about not by the temple and for the temple, but by Jesus for their own community. While this conception is given full expression only in the Fourth Gospel (Jn 15:3; 13:10 and probably 2:6 and 3:25), it must be presupposed also for the congregation which transmitted this controversy story. The answer of Jesus which justifies their action distinguishes between the commandment of God and the oral tradition in a general sense and thus is not as interesting for our present purposes as the specific situation which called it forth.

In Mk 7:15 Jesus³ says: "There is nothing outside of a man which by going into him can render him unclean; but that which comes out

¹ This trait was not really understood by the evangelists, as the statistics show. In the later gospels δαίμονιον is much more frequent than πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον (Mt 11 to 2 times, Lk 23 to 5 times). In Mk each appears 11 times, but outside of the pericope Mk 7:24-30 δαίμονιον is never used in a concrete story but is found in summary statements. The tradition before Mk clearly preferred to speak of "unclean spirits", a conception which Mk and even more the later gospels no longer understood.

² G. Friedrich, op. cit., finds in the exorcisms evidence of a high-priestly Christology. In spite of important individual observations, his thesis as a whole will not stand up to close scrutiny; cf. Cullmann, *Christologie*, p. 104; F. Hahn, *Christologische Hoheitstitel*, 1963, pp. 231ff; and especially J. Gnllka, "Die Erwartung des messianischen Hohenpriesters in den Schriften von Qumran und im Neuen Testament", *RQ* 2 (1960), p. 395-426.

³ That this is a genuine saying is generally admitted; cf. Taylor. *Mk* p. 343.

of a man is what renders him unclean." This saying was evidently not immediately understood by the church. Mark calls it a "dark saying" (παράβολή Vs 17) and appends a series of explanations, 7:18f, 20-23, the sense of which is shown by the parenthetical remark 7:19b "thus declaring all foods clean". Matthew has a different understanding: he connects this saying with the preceding and draws the conclusion: "to eat with unwashed hands does not defile a man" (Mt 15:20b), a Halachah which does not contradict the written Torah.¹ Again, if Jesus had spoken as plainly as Mark assumes, it would be hard to explain such passages as Acts 10 and Romans 14. Nevertheless it must be admitted that by implication at least Jesus really means by this saying what Mark says he means. This is of course important for Jesus' attitude to the law,² but even more for his attitude to the temple. The food laws are declared pointless in this saying and with them all other laws dealing with the distinction between clean and unclean. Since the purity laws existed only for the sake of enabling the people to approach the holy God in the temple cult, the saying Mk 7:15 renders the whole concept of the cult obsolete. "Wer bestreitet, dass die Unreinheit von aussen auf den Menschen eindringt, trifft . . . die Voraussetzungen des gesamten antiken Kultwesens mit seinem Opfer- und Sühnepraxis. Anders gesprochen: Er hebt die für die gesamte Antike grundlegende Unterscheidung zwischen dem Temenos, dem heiligen Bezirk, und der Profanität auf und kann sich deshalb den Sündern zugesellen."³

We have seen that in the generally recognized oldest stratum of Mark, and to a lesser degree in other parts of his gospel, a definite anti-cultic polemic is quite evident. This is all the more significant because it does not correspond to Mark's own attitude. Although this must be examined separately, already our more extended

¹ Cf. B. W. Bacon, *Studies in Matthew*, 1930, p. 224f; G. Barth in Bornkamm, Barth, and Held, *Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäus-Evangelium*, p. 83f; Hummel, op. cit., p. 46ff; W. D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*, p. 104.

² It renders the position of Schoeps, "Jesus und das jüdische Gesetz", *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit*, pp. 212-220, very problematic. While the saying could be interpreted by Mt (cf. 23:23) as emphasizing one kind of defilement while not neglecting the other, thus not criticizing the Torah itself, it is very difficult to read Mk in this fashion.

³ E. Käsemann, "Das Problem des historischen Jesus", *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*, I (1960), p. 207. Cf. Bornkamm, *Jesus von Nazareth*, p. 89f.

discussion of the cleansing of the temple would tend to show that Mark's attitude was one of opposition to the temple rather than opposition to the cult. Cultic questions were relevant chiefly to the Jerusalem congregation, and the early collection of controversy stories we have examined shows that the cult was a matter of dispute between Christians and non-Christians in Jerusalem of the 40's. We now have to ask whether this polemical attitude is contradicted by other passages in the gospels. The commonly accepted dictum of Schrenk cited above says that "der ganze synoptische Aufriss rechnet bei Jesus immer mit beidem: mit der Bejahung des Tempeldienstes als des von Gott bestimmten Weges der Verehrung Gottes und mit der Überlegenheit des Christus über den Tempel." It could be that there is an ambivalent attitude, even a contradiction, in the synoptic tradition, that alongside the polemic also an affirmation of the cult is to be found. The question is whether or not the frequently cited texts really express this affirmation.¹

The most important expressions of a "conservative attitude toward the cult"² are to be found, as might be expected, in the Gospel according to Matthew. It seems however that Matthew is "conservative" mostly in his language. The passage Mt 5:23f can not in any case be used to demonstrate that the early church participated in the temple sacrifices, for the main thrust of the passage does not concern sacrifice at all. "Now if you are offering your gift on the altar and there remember that your brother has anything against you, leave your gift there before the altar and go, first be reconciled to your brother, and then come and offer your gift." This saying is included in a section Mt 5:21-26 having to do with the need for reconciliation and says in effect that this outweighs all cultic

¹ E. Percy, *Die Botschaft Jesu*, p. 119, lists as passages showing the "positive Einstellung Jesu zum Tempel" Mt 5:23f, Mk 1:44, 11:15-19, Acts 5:12, and Mt 23:16-21. They are all discussed in the text. Schrenk, *op. cit.*, p. 242, mentions in addition Lk 18:10-13 (Pharisee and Publican) and Mk 12:41-44 (the widow's gift), but quite aside from the fact that these are only examples, the first deals with prayer not sacrifice (cf. Lohmeyer, *Kultus*, p. 66), and the second concerns the devotion of the widow and not the purpose of her gift (cf. Delling *op. cit.*, p. 17). For all the other passages where *ἱερόν* or *ναός* appear, cf. Schmauch, *op. cit.* p. 94ff. They show neither a positive nor a negative attitude to the cult but are geographical termini. This is true even of passages Schmauch wishes to interpret in a negative sense, e.g. that Satan (Lk 3:9) or the Anti-Christ (Mk 13:14) can appear in the temple. For an opposition to the temple as such, cf. below, pp. 119-61.

² So Hummel, *op. cit.* p. 78.

considerations.¹ No actual sacrifice is envisaged at all, for the saying speaks as if the one offering sacrificed his gift on the altar, whereas in fact only the priest was permitted to approach the altar with the victim. Further, if one can at the last minute "remember" that one needs to be reconciled, then there is no inner connection between the sacrifice and the quarrel.² "If your brother (any brother) has anything (anything at all) against you..." No one who has properly understood the saying would ever think of returning to the altar to continue his sacrifice.³ Couched in such general language, the saying, far from indicating an approval of sacrifice, does not say anything different from the Hosea word "I desire mercy and not sacrifice" quoted in Mt 9:13 and 12:6.

The situation in Mt 23:21 is similar, in that the context does not refer to cultic matters but to the validity of oaths, even mild oaths which do not mention God and therefore seem to avoid a violation of the commandment not to profane the name of the Lord. In fact, says Jesus, an oath by anything involved indirectly the name of God. This logic will be more apparent if we first examine the close parallel in Mt 5:34f: "Do not swear at all, neither by heaven, for 'it is the throne of God' (Is 66:1a), nor by the earth, for 'it is the footstool of his feet' (Is 66:1b), nor by Jerusalem, for 'it is the city of the great king' (Ps 48:3)". Heaven, earth, and Jerusalem all involve God, as is shown by the passages quoted. The argumentation in 23:20-22 is similar, even if there are no direct citations. "He who swears by the altar swears by it and by him who is above it;⁴ and he who swears by the temple swears by it and by him who dwells⁵ therein; and he who swears by heaven swears by the throne of God and by him who sits thereon." The altar, the temple, and heaven all involve God, as is shown by the common opinions quoted. Does this mean that Jesus shares these common opinions? This is doubtful in the case of the altar, but possible in the statement that God dwells in the temple. However, when we consider

¹ In this sense it is comparable to the saying Mk 11:25 = Mt 6:14; cf. Did 4:14, Barn 19:12.

² Yoma 8:9 is then *not* relevant. This must be emphasized against J. Jeremias, "Lass allda deine Gabe (Mt 5, 23f)", *ZNW* 36 (1937), pp. 150-154.

³ Cf. Augustine, *de sermone domini in monte*, I, 26.

⁴ This must be the meaning, even if the present text reads "by all which is on it", viz. the sacrifice, for the previous verse maintains quite correctly that it is the altar which sanctifies the gift. Cf. Manson, *Mission and Message*, p. 527, and Lohmeyer, *Mt*, p. 344.

⁵ Many texts have felt a difficulty here and have changed to "had dwelt".

that Matthew felt no contradiction to his view that the Shekinah dwells in Jesus (cf. Mt 18:20 with Aboth 3:6), it would be very precarious to build any great conclusions from this one passage.

The anti-cultic tendency which we must presuppose for the Jerusalem congregation to be able to account for the Marcan controversy stories has not been contradicted by the two passages we have examined in Matthew. This is also true of Luke. To be sure there is no polemic in the third gospel to correspond to what we have found in the first two, and we also find a very favorable attitude to the temple.¹ This does not in itself mean a favorable attitude to the cult, however, for the temple is seen in a *heilsgeschichtliche* perspective as the center of the people of Israel. It is thus characteristic that the stories of Luke 1-2 should all be centered around the temple. The priest Zechariah has a vision while on duty in the temple (1:8ff), Simeon is inspired by the Spirit to come to the temple to see in the child Jesus God's promised salvation (2:27ff), and it is said of Anna that she "did not depart from the temple, serving (God) with fasting and prayer night and day" (2:37). Nothing is even suggested of the daily sacrifices, for salvation is here an eschatological and not a cultic matter, and the focus of attention is on Jesus. In him the promise of the dwelling of the Shekinah is fulfilled, and not in the temple.² The real significance of the temple for Luke is shown in the story of the twelve year old Jesus Lk 2:41-51. Jesus must be involved "in the things of his Father" in the temple, which the story defines not as sacrifice but as conversation with the teachers of Israel concerning the Torah.

The church which transmitted these stories was vitally interested in the temple but not at all in the cult. Luke shares this interest in the temple, even to the point of mentioning sacrifice, but it is clear that he is so far removed from cultic concerns that he has no real conception of actual sacrificial practice. Thus in 2:22ff Luke assumes that Jesus was brought to the temple to "be presented before the Lord (as it is written in the law of the Lord)" and to "offer a sacrifice according to what is said in the law of the Lord", whereas in fact a purificatory sacrifice was necessary only for the

¹ Luke's attitude to Jerusalem and the temple will be discussed below, pp. 365-369.

² Cf. Lk 1:35 "the power of the Most High will overshadow you" with Ex 40:35 "the cloud overshadowed (*ἐπεσκέλαζεν*, שכן) the tent of meeting and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle (*משכן*)."

mother and the first born was not redeemed in the temple.¹ The other sacrifice Luke mentions is equally false, Acts 21:26f. It may well be that Paul offered a purificatory sacrifice when he returned to Jerusalem and also that he paid the expenses for the sacrifices of four Nazirites, but the manner in which the two are confused by Luke betrays a complete ignorance of cultic matters.² Paul's motive for these acts is quite clear, by the way, and does not imply approval of the cult but rather an expression of solidarity with Israel.³ In both cases Luke's own uninformed interest tends to emphasize the fact that the church before him was not concerned with sacrifices at all.

Luke 24:50-53, a late summary of the situation in the first chapters of Acts,⁴ says of the disciples that "they were continually in the temple blessing God". This summary is not quite correct insofar as it implies that the book of Acts portrays the disciples praying in the temple. It was in the upper room that the disciples "devoted themselves with one accord to prayer" (Acts 1:14), and there that the prayer concerning the successor of Judas took place (1:24). The long prayer 4:24-30 occurred in a "place in which they were gathered together" (4:31), very probably a private house, as did also the prayer at the setting apart of the Seven (6:6). Also the summary 2:41-47 implies that the prayer occurred κατ' οἶκον (2:46), along with the breaking of bread and the fellowship and the teaching of the apostles. Nevertheless the same sentence which says that all of these things happened "in their homes" also says that the disciples were "day by day with one accord continuing steadfastly in the temple."

It is on these two summary statements that the universally held opinion that the early church continued to worship in the temple is based. Unconsciously it is part of the old view, which has been greatly modified in all other respects, that the early pre-Pauline church was only a Jewish sect with a few peculiar ideas about the person of Jesus of Nazareth.⁵ The fact of Jesus of Nazareth has

¹ On the impossibility of the present text and a suggested reconstruction of the Proto-Lucan text, cf. H. Sahlin, *Der Messias und das Gottesvolk*, 1945, pp. 243-246.

² Cf. E. Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1959, pp. 540ff.

³ Cf. W. Schmithals, *Paulus und Jakobus*, 1963, pp. 75ff.

⁴ Cf. below, Chapter IV, p. 247, note 3.

⁵ Cf. e.g. Holtzmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, I, p. 421. The confidence with which the sacrifices of the early church were assumed is

proved to be decisive for the self-understanding of the church in other respects,¹ however, and also this long cherished view must be reexamined. In the light of the Marcan controversy stories, stemming from the Jerusalem church, it is likely that the church from the very beginning abstained from any cultic activities within the temple. Apart from the summaries, there is one individual story in Acts where the validity of this hypothesis can be tested.

Acts 3:1 says that "Peter and John went up to the temple mount at the hour of prayer, the ninth hour." It is usually assumed² that they planned to participate in the prayers that accompanied the evening Tamid sacrifice, although this is not stated and plays no part in the following story. On the contrary, instead of praying they heal a man lame from birth and then preach to the assembled crowd, which might even indicate a contrast to the sacrifices which are simultaneously being performed on the altar.

The assumption that Peter and John were going to the temple to participate in the sacrifices also involves a question of geography: the location of the "Beautiful Gate". Although such a name is unknown in the other sources, it is almost universally sought within the Soreg, to be identified with the Corinthian Gate at the entrance to the court of women (Josephus) or the Nicanor Gate at the entrance to the court of the Israelites (Mishna).³ This assumption involves Luke in a very serious error when he has Peter, John, and the healed lame man enter the Beautiful Gate only to arrive at the Portico of Solomon in the SE corner of the outer court (Vs 11).⁴ It is also assumed that in this particular passage *ἑρὸν* must mean inner court,

shown in his "Die täglichen Gebetsstunden im Judentum und Urchristentum", *ZNW* 12 (1911), pp. 90-107.

¹ Cf. e.g. W. G. Kümmel, *Kirchenbegriff und Geschichtsbewusstsein in der Urgemeinde und bei Jesus*, 1943.

² Recently and explicitly by B. Reicke, *Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde*, 1957, p. 63.

³ On the Beautiful Gate cf. K. Lake in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, V, 1933, pp. 497-486, and J. Duplacy, "A propos d'une variante 'occidentale' des Actes des Apôtres (III, 11)", *Revue des études augustinienes*, 2 (1956), pp. 231-242. In order to identify the Beautiful Gate with the Corinthian Gate of Josephus, Duplacy must assume that the Western text, which has the apostles come out again to enter the Portico of Solomon, is original. This is to let the tail wag the dog.

⁴ That Luke has telescoped his account and really meant that they went into the inner court and then came out again to the Portico of Solomon (so Reicke, op. cit. p. 65) is according to K. Lake, op. cit. p. 484 "obviously a counsel of despair." On the Western reading, cf. previous note.

even if otherwise in Josephus and the New Testament it refers to the whole temple area, including the outer court. Only if the Beautiful Gate is identified with one of the entrances to the temple mount, perhaps as tradition says the Shushan or Easter Gate,¹ perhaps one of the Huldah Gates,² does the story make any geographical sense. That the gate in question must have been one of the outer gates³ is shown by the fact that the lame man had no access to the outer court of the temple at all: "A cripple's stool and its pads are susceptible to midras-uncleanness; and he may not go out with them on the Sabbath or enter with them into the Temple Court"⁴ (Shab 6:8b).⁵ We have therefore to picture the lame man as sitting by one of the outer gates, where he is healed by Peter and John and goes with them into the Portico of Solomon in the outer court. The story Acts 3:1ff says by no means that the disciples went into the inner courts at the time of sacrifice, and we can say no more about what their intention may have been except to point out what they actually did.

That the early church participated in the temple sacrifices can not be demonstrated by the early chapters of Acts; nevertheless the presence of the disciples in the temple is continually emphasized. Why did they go there if not to take part in the cult? The answer is suggested in the summary notice Acts 5:42, "And every day in the temple and in private houses they did not cease to teach and to preach Jesus as the Christ." We even learn where this activity was carried out: in the Portico of Solomon (5:12; 3:11). In the story of the imprisonment of the apostles, the angel who frees them tells them to go to the temple and gives an explicit purpose: "Go and stand, speak in the temple to the people all the words of

¹ Cf. Mid 1:3, Kel 17:9, Ber 9:5, Par 3:6. This gate led directly into the Portico of Solomon. For the tradition cf. Duplacy, *op. cit.*

² These two gates on the south side were the ones most used and therefore most suitable for a beggar.

³ J. Jeremias, *TNWT* III, 173, n. 5, at least leaves the possibility open "bei dem 'schönen' Tor an ein Aussentor des Tempels zu denken."

⁴ עזרה = outer court, cf. 2 Chron 4:9.

⁵ trans. Danby. The same section allows a cripple to enter the temple court if he has a wooden stump or knee pads which allow him to move himself. The cripple in Acts 3:2 however had to be carried and so undoubtedly belonged to the other class. Cf. Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, IIA, p. 33f. Other lame or blind persons are found in the gospels near but not on the temple mount, Jn 5:2ff, 9:1ff. The whole point of Mt 21:14 is that Jesus brings the blind and the lame into the temple area from which the law excludes them and heals them.

this life" (5:20). For the early church in Acts the temple is not the place of the cult but of proclamation, the national center of Israel to whom they are sent. We saw that the statement that the disciples prayed in the temple Lk 24:53 did not really summarize the individual stories of Acts; the summary statement Acts 5:42 is more appropriate when we look at what actually happened in the temple, for every concrete story which mentions the temple shows the disciples preaching: after the healing of the lame man 3:11ff, in the two speeches before the Sanhedrin 4:8ff; 5:29ff and probably on Pentecost 2:5ff. It was the custom to teach in the temple courts,¹ as this was the only large open "village square" in Jerusalem. The disciples preached where the people were to be found coming together, for how else could all Jerusalem be filled with their preaching (5:28)? We find then in the book of Acts no justification for the claim that the early church was favorably disposed toward the temple cult,² and the evidence we have extracted from the gospels has been confirmed.

Our investigation of the attitude of the early church to the temple cult has so far yielded two slightly different attitudes, neither of which can be called positive. On the one hand we have the polemic of the Marcan controversy stories, which has even been strengthened by Matthew. On the other hand we have the more conciliatory approach of Luke and Acts, which without implying approval of the sacrificial cult nevertheless emphasizes the solidarity of the early Christians with Israel, Jerusalem, and the temple. Are these two attitudes to be accounted for by postulating different groups in the early church³ or different times in which the traditions were formulated?⁴ It seems more likely that while the polemic shows the

¹ Cf. Lk 2:46f, Jn 8:12ff, Josephus B.J. I, 78, and A. Büchler, "Learning and Teaching in the Open Air in Palestine", *JQR*, n.s. IV, pp. 485f.

² "Leipoldt (*Gottesdienst*, p. 21) a cependant, en s'appuyant sur Actes 2:46; 3:11; 5:12, 20, 42, soutenu que les Chrétiens célébraient leur culte particulier dans le Temple, spécialement sous le portique de Solomon. Mais les textes qu'il invoque se rapportent à la prédication missionnaire et non au culte proprement dit.", M. Goguel, *L'Eglise Primitif*, p. 272.

³ It would be tempting to derive the hostility to the temple from Galilean Christianity and the friendlier attitude from Jerusalem, but Lohmeyer's distinction (*Galiläa und Jerusalem*, 1936) cannot be upheld. For the anti-semitic tendency often latent in this construction cf. A. Oepke, *Gottesvolk*, pp. 134-141, 183-187. Cf. also N. A. Dahl, *Das Volk Gottes*, p. 181ff.

⁴ It is true that Luke portrays the early church growing up in harmony within Judaism, and that he especially emphasizes the importance of the temple; cf. Conzelmann, *Die Mitte der Zeit*, p. 125f, Haenchen, *Apg.*, p. 565.

church in controversies forced upon it, the actual attitude of most early Christians will have been closer to the impression conveyed by Luke. This attitude can be shown most clearly in a story from Matthew's special material.

The story of the temple tax, Mt 17:24-27, can certainly not be used to show a pro-cultic tendency of the early church.¹ On the contrary, the very fact that the story was transmitted witnesses to a tendency not to pay the temple tax. All who contributed to the expenses of the daily sacrifices also shared in the atonement these sacrifices effected,² but there evidently were some who did not think this was necessary. To such Peter recalls that Jesus always paid the tax, and he transmits to the church Jesus' Halachah on this matter.³ The whole point of the story is to urge the congregation to pay the tax, even if they know they are free, so as not to give offense and to show their solidarity with Israel. The fact that the Christians as sons are free from the temple⁴ is not emphasized but only presupposed. Far from advocating this freedom, the story tries to limit it in the interests of peace with Israel. This attitude is typical of the whole Jerusalem church and even of Paul,⁵ which tends to explain why the attitude of the church to the temple cult was not made more explicit in Luke and Acts. From Mark and Matthew we can conclude that the subject was discussed only when it was forced on the church by their opponents, only when they were forced to explain their attitude of ignoring the temple cult completely.

The attitude of the early church can only be explained if it corresponds to the attitude of Jesus himself. Even if the polemical tone of some passages is to be attributed to the influence of later disputes, still the reason for these disputes must be seen in a practice the disciples learned from Jesus. That Jesus is said to

We shall maintain however that Luke contains a very important old tradition, and that what he emphasizes is already present in his material. Cf. below, Chap. IV.

¹ Townsend, p. 93f, reads out of the story the peculiar idea that the Christians could enjoy the advantages of the temple gratis!

² The story was of course formulated in the period before A.D. 70, after which the tax was paid to the Romans (B.J.VII, 218); cf. Bultmann, *syn. Trad.* p. 34f.

³ W. D. Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 391. Cf. Hummel, *op. cit.*, p. 103ff.

⁴ Cf. Lohmeyer, *Kultus*, p. 64f, *Mt*, p. 275, Oepke, p. 8.

⁵ Cf. W. Schmithals, *op. cit.*, esp. pp. 85ff.

have frequented the temple¹ cannot be adduced as passages "die implicit eine Billigung des Kultus durch Jesus enthalten."² The point of Jesus' teaching in the court of the temple (in the Portico of Solomon, Jn 10:23), like that of the apostles, is clearly expressed in Jn 18:20—he taught there "where all Jews come together", *παρρησία* and not *ἐν κρυπτῷ*. In contrast to what is said concerning Jesus' custom with regard to the synagogue (Lk 4:16), it is never even suggested that Jesus participated in the temple sacrifices.³ The cleansing of the temple is especially important in elucidating Jesus' attitude, and therefore so much space was devoted to its analysis above: behind Mark's opposition to the temple Jesus' teaching was seen to be concerned with non-cultic matters. As far as we can tell, Jesus did not express himself for or against (but cf. Mk 7:15!) the temple as the place of the cult but simply ignored it.⁴ We will not understand the reason for this until we examine those gospel sayings which deal with a substitute for the temple.⁵ For the present Jesus' attitude can perhaps best be characterized as one of sublime indifference.

2. THE DESTRUCTION OF THE TEMPLE

The Gospel according to the Ebionites contained the apocryphal saying of Jesus: "I have come to destroy sacrifice". Lohmeyer accepts this saying as representing at least a correct understanding of Jesus' proclamation and compares it to his interpretation of the saying Mk 14:58, "I am come"—thus we can paraphrase—"to destroy the temple."⁶ This is the question with which we shall be concerned in this section: is Lohmeyer's paraphrase correct, i.e. does the saying "I will destroy this temple" really represent an intention of Jesus of the type of programmatic "I am come"

¹ Mk 11:17, 27; 12:35; 14:49; Mt 21:14; Lk 19:47; 21:37; Jn 2:14ff; 5:14; 7:28; 8:2, 20, 59; 10:23; 18:20.

² Wenschkewitz, op. cit. p. 89. Cf. Schrenk, op. cit. p. 242. Did Paul approve of Greek law and religion because he taught on the Areopagus?

³ Cf. Lohmeyer, *Kultus*, p. 86, Delling, p. 16, Moule, *Worship in the New Testament*, p. 13. While this is only an argument from silence, the silence becomes especially suggestive if the last supper was really a Passover meal—without a lamb!

⁴ Cf. M. Goguel, "Jésus et la tradition religieuse de son peuple", *RHPR* 7 (1927), pp. 154-175, 219-244, who argues that Jesus was completely indifferent to circumcision (p. 170), the Sabbath (p. 170f), ritual purity (p. 133ff) and sacrifices (pp. 220ff).

⁵ Cf. below, pp. 229-243.

⁶ *Kultus und Evangelium*, Göttingen, 1942, p. 78. ET p. 68.

sayings? In the previous section we sought to demonstrate an opposition to the Jerusalem cult in at least a certain tradition behind the Gospels of Matthew and Mark. We concluded with the suggestion that this represents more the polemic of the early Christian congregation than Jesus' own attitude, which we characterized as a sublime indifference to all cultic questions. Should Lohmeyer prove to be right, however, we would have to revise this earlier suggestion and postulate a very deep interest in the cult on the part of Jesus, in order to account for his supposed opposition to the temple.

These two attitudes: opposition to the temple and opposition to the cult, are related but by no means to be confused, for they could be expressions of quite different conceptions. The latter is directed against the cult as such, which is seen no longer to represent the will of God so that that which it should have achieved is to be sought in quite different areas of religious expression. Such an attitude could eventually result in the demand that the vain but seductive temple services should cease, even that the temple should be destroyed.¹ It is however much more natural to consider the antiquated temple simply as antiquated and to ignore it.² An opposition to the cult as such would probably result in an indifferent attitude toward the temple. It is quite a different matter when the correct performance of the cult is taken seriously and the opposition is directed against current abuses. Then it may become imperative to "cleanse" the temple of profanations, to restore the proper cult, perhaps even to destroy the old in order to build a new purified temple. An opposition to the temple is much more apt to result from a high estimation of the cult resulting in an opposition to current cultic practices than from an opposition to the cult as such. On the other hand a thoroughgoing indifference in cultic matters would likely also be indifferent to the question of the continued existence of the temple. Opposition to the temple and opposition to the cult are at first to be found in inverse proportion to one another, and only after a period of frustration can one directly affect the other.³

¹ One could compare the measures undertaken against pagan temples by Constantius.

² One could compare the attitude of the Christians of Asia Minor referred to by Pliny, *Epistolae*, X, 96, when he says that the temples had been almost deserted and the sacrificial animals had met with but few purchasers.

³ Something of this complex attitude whereby a high evaluation of the

The saying of Jesus, "I will destroy this temple and in three days I will build it" is an expression of opposition to the temple, which is to be destroyed, but also a high estimation of the cult, for the temple will be rebuilt. The two belong together, for the only reason for the destruction of the old must be because the sacrifices offered there were in some sense inadequate, and a new temple must be built to house the future perfected cult. One could very properly speak of a cleansing of the temple in this connection, for the old is purified, even destroyed, only to make way for the new. Jesus' intention of destroying the temple would then be only a necessary means to an end, the eschatological rebuilding of the temple in the age to come. In fact the saying Mk 14:58 is usually interpreted in this manner, even if not quite so explicitly. Whether this interpretation is correct remains to be seen.

The background of Jesus' statement is usually sought in the supposed apocalyptic expectation of a new temple. Typical of many¹ is R. Bultmann: "schon vor der Zerstörung des herodianischen Tempels im Jahre 70 bestand die Hoffnung, dass die messianische Zeit einen neuen herrlicheren Tempel bringen werde."² This statement has been accepted and quoted for years without ever being tested against the sources. The origin of the conception seems to rest on a pronouncement of Billerbeck³ and an impressive list of texts adduced by Bousset.⁴ Much more tenuous, but almost

cult goes hand in hand with opposition to the temple and can eventually lead to a disparagement of sacrifice as such can be found in the suggestive article by O. Cullmann, "L'opposition contre le temple de Jérusalem, motif commun de la théologie johannique et du monde ambiant", *NTS* 5 (1958), pp. 157-173.

¹ H. Wenschkewitz, *Spiritualisierung*, p. 98; J. Jeremias, *Weltvollender*, p. 38; E. Lohmeyer, *Markus*, p. 327; V. Taylor, *Mark*, p. 567; W. G. Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 101; E. Simon, "Retour du Christ", p. 248; Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, p. 93; Schrenk, *TWNT*, III, 239, 244; O. Michel, *TWNT*, IV, 888; Strathmann, *TWNT*, VI, 524.

² *syn. Trad.* p. 126.

³ "Solange das Heiligtum stand, also bis zum Jahre 70 n. Chr., hat man wohl allgemein erwartet, dass die messianischen Heilszeit die Herrlichkeit des Tempels ebenso mehren werde wie die Schönheit und Pracht Jerusalems . . . Seit dem Jahre 70 wandelte sich diese Erwartung dann zu der Hoffnung, dass in den Tagen des Messias der Tempel in unbeschreiblicher Herrlichkeit neu erstehen werde, um nie mehr zu vergehen." *Kommen-tar*, I, p. 1003f, cf. IV, p. 884f.

⁴ Bousset-Gressmann, *Religion des Judentums*, 3 Aufl., pp. 238-240. All of the texts which he adduces for the period before 70 A.D. are discussed in our text.

as frequently quoted, is the assumption that the Jewish texts occasionally expect the Messiah to destroy and rebuild the temple.¹ If, as we hope to show, the new temple was not an important part of Jewish eschatology before A.D. 70, and the Messiah was never expected to build it anyway, then some other explanation must be sought for the strange saying attributed to Jesus.

Because the destruction of the temple in Mk 14:58 is only a preliminary act subordinate to the building of the eschatological temple, this expectation must first be examined to see whether in fact it provides a background for the saying. Also the role of the Messiah in Jewish expectations concerning the temple must be questioned. Then we shall examine the opposition to the temple as such, as this is developed in the apocalyptic literature, Qumran, and the early church. Only then will we be in a position to explain the origin of Mk 14:58.

A. The Expectation of the New Temple

With the fall of the first temple in 586 B.C. the Heilsgeschichte of the Old Testament had come to an end. If anything further were to happen in Israel it would be only because God had determined to make a completely new beginning. This is essentially what the prophecy of Second Isaiah proclaimed, that God was about to elect his people all over again, that he would lead them in a new exodus, which will so far surpass the first exodus that it can only be described in terms of a new creation. In addition to these two traditions, Second Isaiah makes use of a third originally quite separate tradition: that of the new Zion.² The new exodus will end not just in the promised land but quite specifically in the new Jerusalem. Not only is there no room in this picture of the glorious future for an Israelite Messiah (the title is given away to Cyrus in 45:1),³ but it also seems

¹ Cf. most recently Hummel, *op. cit.*, p. 93, and cf. below, p. 147. ff.

² Cf. G. von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, Bd I, pp. 54ff; Bd II, pp. 166ff; H. J. Krauss, *Psalmen*, pp. 342ff.

³ Cf. M. Noth, "Jerusalem und die israelitische Tradition," *Gesammelte Studien zum AT* (1957), pp. 172-187. On the one hand, "die vorexilischen Propheten reden in den messianischen Weissagungen nicht von Jerusalem" (p. 181); but on the other hand, "diese offenbar geringe Einschätzung von Jerusalem als Königsstadt steht nur um so bemerkenswerter gegenüber die Würdigung der Stadt als Stätte der göttlichen Gegenwart, wobei nur an das Heiligtum mit der Lade gedacht sein kann" (p. 182). The last part of the second quotation is an untested and it seems unwarranted assumption.

that there is no room for a temple in the new Jerusalem.¹ There are many occasions on which one would expect mention of the restoration of the temple service, so that this silence is indicative. The cult has been of no avail in the past (43:23f), and in the future God will forgive independently of any cultic mediation. The tradition of the ark was after all originally independent of the Zion tradition, which comes ultimately from pre-Davidic Jerusalem, so that the distinction between Zion and the temple is not an artificial one. It is important to note at the outset that it is possible to speak of the restoration of Israel in terms of the Zion tradition with no mention of the temple at all.

After Second Isaiah there was no new prophecy in Israel, for the message of all subsequent prophets is essentially actualization, that now, in their time, this prophecy from the exile is beginning to come true. Accordingly post-exilic eschatology, as this is found in such passages as Is 34-35, Joel 3, Zech 12-14, Ezek 38-39, Is 24-27, remains in the Zion tradition, and there is no mention of a rebuilding of the temple. The dwelling place of God on earth will not be the *debir* of the temple but the whole glorified city, which is described in increasingly mythological terms. Thus the streams of living water which will flow from Jerusalem² have more to do with the mountain of paradise, the highest mountain of the world,³ than with the temple. Two contradictory conceptions concerning the Gentiles became part of the Zion tradition: one tells of the last great battle of all the nations against the holy city,⁴ and the other, sometimes combined with the first, speaks of the eschatological pilgrimage of the Gentiles to Mount Zion, the center of God's redemptive activity for the whole world.⁵ Zion is the place where God alone rules as king, and just as there is no room for a Messiah in such a vision of the future, so there is also really no need for the temple. As the holiness of God's presence was transferred in the time of Solomon from the ark to the temple, so now from the temple to the city.

¹ Is 44:28c is a secondary gloss meant to explicate the promise of vs 26, so the commentaries by Duhm, Marti, Cheyne, et al.

² Ps 46:5, Joel 4:18, Ezek 47, Zech 14:8, Is 33:21.

³ Ps 46:2f; 48:3, Is 2:1ff, Mic 4:1ff, Ezek 17:20ff; 40:2, Zech 14:10.

⁴ Ps 46, Ezek 38f, Is 17:12ff; 29:8, Mic 4:11, Zech 12, Sib III, 663, Jub 23:22ff, En 56, 4 Esr 13.

⁵ Is 2:1ff, Mic 4:1ff, Is 45:14, 23; 56:7; 60; 61:18ff, Jer 3:17, Zeph 3:10, Zech 8:20ff; 14, Tobit 13:9ff, Sib III, 772ff.

The importance of the Zion tradition cannot be over-emphasized. Jerusalem-Zion becomes the center of all eschatological hope, the place where God dwells with his people, the kingdom of God. Often it is the community itself which is meant by the symbol "Jerusalem" (Is 40:1f and often afterward), and the term takes on broader and broader implications. "Erleichtert wurde die eschatologisch bedingte Steigerung der Wertschätzung Jerusalems dadurch, dass nach dem Zurücktreten der Lade hinter den Tempel als Ort der Gegenwart Jahwes auch das Tempelgebäude durch die heilige Stätte Jerusalem selbst als den örtlich festliegenden und alleinberechtigten Kultort ersetzt werden konnte, so dass die Stadt mit ihrem 'heiligen Berg' zum Mittelpunkt der gläubigen Israeliten in Palästina und in der Diaspora werden konnte."¹ It is distinctively a secondary matter whether or not there is a temple in the expected new Jerusalem. "Passage after passage makes it clear that it is Jerusalem which gives the Temple its sanctity, not the Temple, Jerusalem."² It is Jerusalem which is the dwelling place of God and the means and goal of salvation, not the temple, not the Messiah. "Il y a une eschatologie sans Messie (and I would add: sans temple). . . mais il n'y a point d'eschatologie sans l'attente du grand rassemblement à Jérusalem, centre du monde, cité de l'avenir, cité de Dieu."³ The hope described by the seer of Revelation: "I saw the holy city, new Jerusalem . . . and I saw no temple in the city, for its temple is the Lord God the Almighty" (Rev 21:2, 22) is, despite the rather strong statement of Billerbeck to the contrary,⁴ a legitimate development from much of the eschatology of the time of the second temple.

Also the great description of the future temple, Ezekiel 40ff, belongs in this connection. The city on the great high mountain (40:2) and the paradise stream (47) point in this direction, as well as the fact that it is the city which receives the name *Yahweh shammah*.⁵ Nevertheless, the author of these chapters is extremely interested in the temple service—almost the whole of his description is devoted to this theme—and it is undoubtedly through him that

¹ Fohrer, *TWNT*, VII, 304.

² Parkes, *The Foundations of Judaism and Christianity*, 1960, p. 29.

³ A. Causse, "Le mythe de la nouvelle Jérusalem du Deutéro-Esaïe à la III^e Sibylle," *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuse*, 18 (1938), pp. 377-414, citation p. 397.

⁴ "in der alten Synagoge einfach undenkbar" *Kommentar*, IV, p. 884.

⁵ 48:35, cf. Is 62:4, 12, Jer 3:17; 33:16, Zech 8:3.

the temple enters into the later Zion tradition as a part of the new Jerusalem. This is however not something which can be presupposed but must be investigated in each case. It is not the mere presence of the temple in descriptions of the new Jerusalem which is important, but whether or not any function is assigned to the temple as distinguished from the city as a whole.

The temple can no longer simply be assumed as the location of the presence of God with his people, for this function is often taken over by the city as a whole. It is only specifically indicated when mention is made of sacrifices in the new Jerusalem, and even then we must consider that sacrifice can be offered elsewhere. The well-known anti-cultic passages in the prophets¹ are of course directed against abuses of the cult and do not as such advocate its abolition. Nevertheless, while we hear predictions of the destruction of the temple, there is nothing in the pre-exilic prophecy of salvation to indicate that the cult will be restored. Indeed it seems that when God cleanses Israel (Ezek 36:25, cf. 1 QS IV, 21), renewing and teaching the heart directly, there will be no need for the cult. On the other hand, when we turn to the actual situation of the exiles we find cultic expiation still very much a necessity. Although already now Israel was developing study, Sabbath, and prayer as substitutes for sacrifice,² the general conception is typified more by the addition to Ps 51 ("rebuild the walls of Jerusalem; then thou wilt delight in right sacrifice" Vs 18f) than by the body of the Psalm ("the sacrifice acceptable to God is a broken spirit" Vs 17). The exiles in Babylon did not lack much of building a temple there, and they probably did offer sacrifice (cf. Ezra 8:15ff). In any case a temple was built in the Jewish colony at Elephantine,³ and later another on Mount Gerizim. Apart from an actual temple, sacrifice was offered in various places, as it was on the ruins of the temple in Jerusalem (Jer 41:5, Ezra 3:2-6). The offering of sacrifice must not necessarily be connected with the existence of a temple, and this was not the moving cause behind the building of the second

¹ Am 4:4; 5:4, 21ff; 9:1, Hos 6:6, Is 1:10-17; 29:13, Mic 6:6-8, Jer 6:20; 7:1ff; 11:15, Is 43:22-24; 66:1ff. Cf. Volz, "Die radikale Ablehnung der Kultreligion durch die alttestamentlichen Propheten", *Zeit. Syst. Theol.* 14 (1937), pp. 63-85.

² Cf. Salo W. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, Vol. 1 (Philadelphia, 1952), pp. 121ff.

³ Cf. A. Vincent, *Réligion des Judéo-Araméens*, pp. 144ff.

temple. It was because of the "resignierter Sicherheit"¹ of the Jerusalem congregation, comparable to the opposite *Sicherheit* against which Jeremiah (7; 26) had to protest, that made the rebuilding of the temple a matter of a *status confessionis*. The building of the second temple was significant not so much because of the temple itself, but because the rebuilding became an expression of trust in God's promises concerning Jerusalem and the people in the Zion tradition.

Before the rebuilding of 537-515 B.C., the new temple definitely did not occupy the center of Israelite expectation. Although it might be included in the expectation of the new Jerusalem (Ezek 40ff), it can also be specifically excluded. Thus an oracle from this time in Jer 3:15ff says that "the ark of the covenant of the Lord shall not come to mind or be remembered or missed; it shall not be made again.² At that time Jerusalem (not the ark!) shall be called the throne of the Lord, and all nations shall gather to it." The most impressive example is found in the collection of oracles known as Trito-Isaiah. Here we have the most glorious description of the new Jerusalem to which the nations shall stream (Is 60) and also the sharpest denunciation of the temple and the sacrificial cult (Is 66:1-6).

After the building of the second temple, the expectation that the new Jerusalem would contain a temple became more general. It may very well be the contrast between the magnificent predictions of Ezekiel and the actual rebuilt temple that led to the hope of a new temple in the future. The temple of Zerubbabel was simply "not like the former one" (Tob 14:5), and although sacrifices were offered, "not as fully as at the beginning" (syr Bar 68:6).³ Some of the writings of this time can express approval of the existing temple, perhaps most clearly Jesus Sirach: "Fill Zion with thy praise and thy temple with glory",⁴ where no rebuilding is envisaged

¹ G. von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, Bd. II, p. 294.

² Contrast 2 Mac 2:4ff and 2 Bar 6:7-9, which suppose the ark to be hidden until the end time.

³ For the Rabbis too (Num Rab XV, 10) the second temple lacked five things which Solomon's temple had contained and which would be restored in the future temple: the ark, candlestick, fire, the Holy Spirit, and the Cherubim. One passage (bYoma 9a) even deduces from Gen 9:27 that the Shekinah was not in the second temple at all, because it was built by Persians and not the sons of Shem.

⁴ Hebrew text of 36:14, published by I. Lévi, Brill, 1951. LXX reads λαόν for ναόν.

at all. But even disappointment concerning the second temple as compared to the first hardly constitutes the hope for a new temple as an integral part of the eschatological expectation of Judaism at this time.

The Zion tradition remains much more important, even if a new temple should often be included as a part of the new Jerusalem. Thus Tobit 13:9-18 can speak of the holy city to which the nations will stream, and whose glorious rebuilding is described in terms derived from Isaiah 60, but he can also incidentally hope that "the house of God will be rebuilt there with a glorious building for all generations forever" (14:5). Jubilees can speak of the dwelling of God in terms of the Zion tradition: "until I descend and dwell with them throughout eternity. . . and all shall know that I am the God of Israel and the Father of all the children of Jacob and King on Mount Zion for all eternity. And Zion and Jerusalem shall be holy." (1:26-28). Or it can speak of this dwelling specifically in terms of the temple: "I will rebuild my sanctuary in their midst and I will dwell with them" (1:17).¹ However, the temple does not have nearly as important a function as "Mount Zion, which will be sanctified in the new creation for a sanctification of the earth" (4:26).

The temple acquired new significance by the crisis brought about by Antiochos Epiphanes in 168 B.C. On the one hand, because the temple desecration was part of a threat to the very existence of Israel, one of the marks of political and religious loyalty to the people of God became zeal for the temple. On the other hand, because of the cessation of the legitimate highpriesthood, several sectarian movements out of devotion to the purity of the cult developed an antipathy to the temple. Both these tendencies left their mark on the eschatological expectation, although in the apocalyptic writings that have come down to us the latter was much stronger, as we shall see.

The destruction of the temple in A.D. 70, as we have said above, was a severe loss to Pharisaic Judaism, because there was no substitute for the cult and even more because the temple had become a

¹ Cf. Jub 25:21, En 91:13, Syr Bar 32:4. L. Finkelstein, *The Pharisees*, 1962, p. cxiv, says of Jubilees: "It is not clear whether the author approved the existence of a Temple structure like that reared by Solomon . . . (He) may well have deplored substitution for the simple wilderness tabernacle of the imposing structures built by Solomon, later by the returning exiles, and finally made impressive under Herod."

sign of election. The expectation of a new temple reached a high pitch when the rebuilding became in the time of Trajan a real possibility, and ever afterward it has been part of the Jewish hope for the future. Even here, however, it is subordinate to the Zion tradition. Often the temple is mentioned merely as one of the hoped for restorations, as in the fourteenth petition of the Eighteen Benedictions: "Have mercy, O Lord our God, in thy great mercy, on Israel thy people and on Jerusalem thy city and on Zion the dwelling of thy glory and on thy temple and on thy dwelling and on the kingdom of the house of David, thine righteous anointed. Blessed art thou, O Lord the God of David, thou who buildest Jerusalem."¹ In the age to come there will be a temple as there will be a king, but the essential aspect of the future hope is the new Jerusalem itself, which is described in terms of the Zion tradition. Later descriptions² mention the temple but incidentally, while they go into great detail concerning Jerusalem, and it is clear that it is the latter which is thought of as a figure for the dwelling of God with his people. When it is said for example that the city will extend as far as Damascus, "in solchen Aussagen ist der Begriff der Stadt fallengelassen und Jerusalem wie schon in der nachexilischen biblischen Eschatologie in allgemeinerem Sinn als 'Stätte der Heilszeit', als 'Sitz des Reiches Gottes' gefasst."³

A great deal of confusion has been introduced into modern biblical studies by the refusal clearly to distinguish between Jerusalem and the temple. When Bousset⁴ groups together texts referring to either temple or city he is much less perceptive than Volz,⁵ who separates the two conceptions, but unhappily Volz has not been followed in this matter. On the other hand, no important distinction should be made between the future Jerusalem and the heavenly Jerusalem, as this latter is due more to the visionary form

¹ Palestinean version printed in Staerk, *Altjüdische liturgische Gebete*, p. 13. The Babylonian version, while it speaks specifically of the temple service (17), mentions the dwelling of God in connection with Jerusalem (14). Cf. the old Musaph prayer: "rule in Jerusalem thy city, and may the dwelling of thy glory be on Mount Zion!"

² Cf. Billerbeck, IV, pp. 920ff; Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde*, pp. 371ff; Lohse, *TWNT*, VII, 324f.

³ Volz, op. cit., p. 372.

⁴ Op. cit., p. 238-40. In addition to the passages we have discussed, he also cites for the building of the future temple Sib III, 657 and 725f, but in both cases the received text reads λαός and there is no need to alter it to ναός.

⁵ Op. cit. pp. 371-376 and 376-378.

of the description than to any Greek ideas of pre-existence.¹ Great damage has been done by a statement of Billerbeck² which is continually quoted: "Für das jüdische Denken war es etwas Selbstverständliches, dass dem neuen Jerusalem auch der Tempel nicht fehlen werde." For the period before A.D. 70 this is simply not true.³ Although the new Jerusalem is exceedingly important in apocalyptic, their attitude to the temple is much more ambiguous. There are a great many texts from the Maccabean and Herodian periods whose attitude can perhaps best be summed up under the rubric "cleansing of the temple".

B. *The Cleansing of the Temple*

When the hope for a new and better temple is expressed at a time when the second temple was still standing, then of course the old temple must be removed, in a sense destroyed, before the new one is erected. This may mean no more than what Herod did to the Temple of Zerubbabel before he rebuilt it, namely that "he took away the old foundations and laid others and erected the temple upon them."⁴ Although something similar can be presupposed for the eschatological hopes of those who looked on the present temple with favor (Sirach, proto-Sadducees), in fact it is not expressed in any extant texts.

If the existing temple has been profaned, then it must be cleansed of its impurity before its sacrifices can become valid again and its worship meaningful. Thus Hezekiah cleansed the temple of the defilements of Ahaz (2 Chron 29:12ff), Josiah of those of Manasseh

¹ Cf. G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, Vol. II, p. 343f; O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, pp. 261f; and especially K. L. Schmidt, "Jerusalem als Urbild und Abbild", *Eranos Jahrbuch* XVIII (1959), pp. 207-248.

² *Kommentar*, IV, p. 884. Cf. Strathmann, *TWNT* VI, 524, "bezeichnend ist dabei, dass die Erneuerung der Stadt und die des Tempels mit seinem Kultus stets miteinander verbunden erscheinen."

³ One might be tempted to find exceptions also for the Rabbinic period, in view of several passages which seem to imply that there will be no cult in the age to come, cf. Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, IV, pp. 936ff. However, W. D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*, pp. 161ff, thinks that this would be a false interpretation. The importance of the Torah was so great that all parts of it would continue in effect even then.

⁴ Josephus, *Ant.* XV, 391. The preceding lines describe the fear of the people that Herod might destroy the old without being able to build the new, but the king prepared all the building material beforehand and "told them he would not pull down their temple till all things were gotten ready for building it up entirely again."

(2 Chron 34:3ff), and Nehemiah of those of Tobiah (Neh 13:4-9). The temple was regularly cleansed on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16), and the new temple of Ezekiel would have to be cleansed before it could be used (Ezek 45:18ff). The most impressive example of the cleansing of the temple is of course that of the Maccabees (1 Mac 4:36ff, 2 Mac 10:1ff). For them it was enough to replace the defiled altar, make the necessary repairs, and return the sacred vessels to the interior of the temple.

Many of the contemporaries of the Maccabees felt that their cleansing had not gone far enough. It is very doubtful if Daniel, who was also concerned about the desecration of the temple, would have been satisfied with these measures. For the supporters of Onias, the temple was not cleansed on 25 Chislev, and they continued to offer sacrifice in their temple in Leontopolis (Ant XIII, 62-73).¹ For the Samaritans the Jerusalem cult was from the very beginning illegitimate, and they continued to offer sacrifice on Mount Gerizim even after John Hyrcanus destroyed their temple in 128 B.C. The Essenes were certainly not alone in their opposition to a profaned temple and impure cult. A more thorough cleansing became part of the eschatological expectation of many at this time.

The conception of an eschatological cleansing of the temple because of cultic practices which had become a profanation in the eyes of the dissenters goes back at least to Malachi. The prophet complains that the priests of his day (c. 450 B.C.) despise the name of Yahweh and offer polluted food on his altar. But they kindle fire upon the altar in vain, for Yahweh will not accept their sacrifices; he will curse the priests and their offerings and put them out of his presence (1:6 - 2:3). It would be better if the temple were closed completely (1:10), for it is not necessary and even the Gentiles offer more acceptable worship (1:11). No suggestion is given of a future temple in this oracle of judgement, but we hear in 3:1ff that Yahweh himself will cleanse the profaned temple: he "will come suddenly to his temple", and he will send his messenger "to purify (טהר LXX καθαρίσει) the sons of Levi and refine them like gold and silver, until they present right offerings to the Lord". It

¹ Perhaps something of the disdain of the Onias priesthood for the Jerusalem clerus can be seen in the presumably Egyptian LXX of Esther, which calls the Jerusalemite Dositheus "he who claims to be a priest and a Levite" (10:31).

is not said whether this purification will involve the destruction of the old temple in a refiner's fire, but it is at least conceivable.

The only text which explicitly mentions the destruction of the second temple is Enoch 90:28f: "And I stood up to see till they folded up that old house; and carried off all the pillars; and all the beams and ornaments of the house were at the same time folded up with it; and they carried it off and laid it in a place in the south of the land. And I saw till the Lord of the sheep brought a new house greater and loftier than that first, and set it up in the place of the first which had been folded up: all its pillars were new and its ornaments were new and larger than those of the first, the old one which He had taken away, and all the sheep were within it." In common with the rest of Jewish eschatology, this text refers to the building of the new Jerusalem ("the new house"), but differing from most of the rest, it also explicitly says that the old Jerusalem must first be removed. It must be emphasized that it is Jerusalem which is being spoken about ("all the sheep were within it") and not at all the temple, which the author symbolizes by a tower.¹ His attitude to the second temple itself is indicated by his description of it in the following language: "They began again to build as before, and they reared up that tower, and it was named the high tower; and they began to place a table before the tower, but all the bread on it was polluted and not pure" (89:73). If the service of the second temple was so corrupted, then we should perhaps see in the removal of the old Jerusalem not just a necessary preliminary act to bringing the new but quite distinctly a judgment. One could speak of a cleansing of Jerusalem and its temple by destruction. It is also very significant that there is no new tower mentioned in the new house.² In any case the author does not stand alone in his negative evaluation of the temple cult of the present.

The Assumption of Moses says of the Hasmoneans that they "shall call themselves priests of the Most High God and they shall

¹ J. Jeremias, *Weltvollender*, p. 38f, seems to be the source of the idea, which is encountered again and again, that En 90:21f refer to the destruction and rebuilding of the temple. He was decisively refuted by Volz, *Eschatologie*, p. 217, who shows that the house stands quite clearly for Jerusalem and not the temple. When Schrenk, *TWNT*, III, p. 239 objects, "Aber es gibt eben kein Jerusalem ohne den Tempel", he begs the whole question. This is what I meant above about the pernicious influence of Billerbeck's statement.

² Also Bar 5, Test Dan 5, Test Levi 18 seem to imply that there will be no temple in the new Jerusalem.

surely work iniquity in the holy of holies" (6:1). They "shall defile with pollution the house of their worship" and "shall pollute the altar with the very gifts which they offer to the Lord" (5:3f). In this situation Israel "will not be able to offer sacrifices to the Lord of their fathers" (4:8).¹ The Testament of Levi 16:1 says of the whole post-exilic period: "I have learnt that for 70 weeks ye shall go astray, and profane the priesthood, and pollute the sacrifices." Jubilees 23:21 speaks of those who "defile the holy of holies with their uncleanness and the corruption of their pollution" and mentions 30:14f marriage to a Gentile as one of the means of this profanation. This note of profanation through sexual uncleanness, which we shall meet in the Dead Sea Scrolls, is also found in Ps Sol 8:13, "They trode the altar of the Lord, (coming straight) from all manner of uncleanness; and with menstrual blood they defiled the sacrifices."² The Psalms of Solomon complain that "the sons of Jerusalem have defiled the holy things of the Lord, have profaned with iniquities the offerings of God" (2:3), that "they have utterly polluted the holy things of the Lord" (1:8), and that therefore the temple has been further profaned by the Gentiles. In another sense Pompey acted to cleanse the temple of Jewish profanation, for "he poured out the blood of the inhabitants of Jerusalem like the waters of uncleanness" (8:23). Thus in writings all related to the Qumran sect³ we find the constant complaint that the temple has been desecrated and the sacrifices rendered impure. The starting point of this attitude is without doubt the deposition of the legitimate High Priest Onias in the year 174, followed by the "abomination of desolation" set up by Antiochos Epiphanes in 168, and finally by the line of Hasmonean High Priests beginning with Jonathan in 152. Whenever the profanation of the temple is discussed in this period in connection with an eschatological framework, the cleansing of the temple goes far beyond the rededication of the Maccabees.

¹ So Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, Vol. II, p. 417, but this verse may refer to the time before the building of the second temple. Note that the first temple was destroyed (3:1f) because Israel had profaned the sanctuary through idol worship (2:8). Also Jub 1:10 says that Solomon's temple was destroyed because Israel has forsaken "my holy place . . . and my tabernacle and my sanctuary."

² Cf. below, p. 125, note 1.

³ On the Essene affinities of the Ps Sol, as well as Jub, Enoch, Test XII, and Ass Mos, cf. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (1962), pp. 296, 337.

As the example of Antiochos shows, the sanctity of the temple was not only defiled by supposed iniquities within Israel, but it also was constantly threatened by the heathen powers.¹ It is this concern which is uppermost in the mind of the author of Psalm of Solomon 17. The interest of this Psalm, as of the others quoted above, is a cultic one, and its prayer is that God "may deliver us from the uncleanness of unholy enemies" (Vs 46 Rahlfs). When the Messiah comes he will have a double task: he shall "rebuken rulers and remove sinners" (36); on the one hand he shall "destroy the godless nations with the word of his mouth" (24) and on the other he shall "gather a holy people" and "not suffer righteousness to lodge any more in their midst" (26f). Just as the primary function of the king was externally to defend the nation as leader of its army and internally to see to the establishment of justice, just as the "branch" in Is 11:1-5 is to "smite the earth with the rod of his mouth" and to "judge the poor with righteousness", so the Messiah of Ps Sol 17 acts both to defeat the heathen enemies who threaten Jerusalem and to rebuke the sinners within Jerusalem. Both of these tasks are described as *cleansing* Jerusalem; on the one hand that he may "cleanse Jerusalem from the nations that trample her down to destruction" (25) and on the other that he may "cleanse Jerusalem with a sanctification as of old" (30).² Although the temple is not explicitly mentioned in this Psalm, it is conceivable that the cleansing of Jerusalem might even involve its destruction.³

It is of course characteristic of a prophecy of judgment that it concentrate on the evil to be removed rather than on what will come afterward. Thus the words of Jesus son of Ananias, together with his repeated "Woe to Jerusalem!", speak only of the coming destruction: "A voice from the east, a voice from the west, a voice from the four winds; a voice against Jerusalem and the sanctuary, a voice against the bridegroom and the bride, a voice against all

¹ Cf. Hengel, *Die Zeloten*, pp. 211-215: "Die Bedrohung des Tempels durch die heidnische Herrschaft."

² In Ps Sol 18:5 it is God who cleanses Israel before he brings the Messiah.

³ After the destruction of the temple it is assumed that this will be the prelude to the judgement in syrBar 20:2, "Therefore have I now taken away Zion that I may the more speedily visit the world in its season", and that the temple will not be rebuilt, cf. 10:10, "And thou, vine, why further dost thou give thy wine; for an offering will not again be made therefrom in Zion, nor will first fruits again be offered." According to Sib IV, 117f the temple was destroyed because "confident in their folly they shall cast godliness to the winds and commit hateful murders before the temple."

the people." (B.J. VI, 301). Unfortunately we are not given the reason for this prophecy of destruction, but the use made of Jeremiah (7:34) leads one to suppose that also Jesus son of Ananias complained of the defilement of city and temple.

The destruction of the temple by Titus was seen by some as a judgment of God on the temple, a "cleansing" of the pollutions by complete destruction. While the various statements in Jewish legend¹ that God destroyed the temple are probably due to a reluctance to attribute such an act to Titus, Josephus in one place quite clearly speaks of God cleansing the temple: "God had condemned the city to destruction because of its pollutions and wished to cleanse (ἐκκαθαροῦναι) the sanctuary by fire."² It is hard to tell whether Josephus is serious or whether he is merely cynically reversing the program of the Zealots.

A very important example of an actual cleansing of the temple is that carried out by the Zealots. Because the sanctity of the temple had been continually threatened by the Gentiles Antiochos, Pompey, Pilate, Caligula the most important expression of national feeling came to be zeal for the temple. The temple had been profaned by the heathen powers and by those priests who had cooperated with them, and accordingly the first act of the Zealots when they came into power was to "cleanse" the temple. In the case of the Antonia this even involved destruction by fire (B.J. II, 430). The daily sacrifice for the emperor was stopped, Gentiles and the impure were rigorously excluded from the temple area, Pharisaic halachah was enforced in place of that of the Sadducees, the collaborating priests were killed and a new high priest installed.³ One has only to consider these measures to understand why the term "cleansing of the temple" is inapplicable to Jesus' action in Mk 11:15-17. The act of the Zealots is of course a successful cleansing from their point of view, and the cleansed temple would continue to occupy an important place in their hopes for the future. It is when the desire to cleanse the temple was frustrated that we get

¹ Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, Vol. VI, pp. 392f; syrBar 8.

² B. J. IV, 323, cf. B.J. VI, 250, "God had sentenced the temple to flames", but this latter statement may mean no more than the "supernatural impulse" (252) of the soldier who actually started the fire, or the "fate" (267) from which there is no escape. The destruction of the temple is called a cleansing also in B.J. II, 539; V, 412; VI, 108, 138. Cf. E. Riggensbach, *Auf den Trümmern Jerusalems*, Basel, 1923.

³ Cf. Hengel, *Die Zeloten*, pp. 223-226.

more violent eschatological expectations. We turn to one last possible example.

Daniel is exceedingly difficult to interpret in this connection. He says of Antiochos Epiphanes: "Forces from him shall appear and profane the temple and fortress and shall take away the continual burnt offering. And they shall set up the appalling abomination" (11:31). The corresponding passage in 8:11 says that he removed the Tamid, "and the place of his (i.e. God's) sanctuary was thrown down (תִּשְׁמָד)." ¹ The "abomination" in Daniel seems much worse than that of 1 Mac 1:54, and it may be that he expected the temple to be completely destroyed. The massoretic text of 9:26 is probably corrupt, but as it stands it says that "the people of the prince who is to come will destroy the city and the sanctuary."² This seems to say that the temple will be completely destroyed, either by Antiochos³ or possibly by the Messiah.⁴ We must beware of reading Daniel too much in the light of what actually happened according to 1 Maccabees. In particular the cleansing measures which satisfied the Maccabees would surely not have satisfied Daniel. For him Antiochos' abomination was the beginning of the end, and the temple would be purified only by its complete destruction. It is significant that there is in Daniel no mention of a hoped-for rebuilding or rededication of the temple. In Daniel 2 a great stone "not made with hands" shatters the fourth kingdom and becomes a "kingdom which shall never be destroyed" (2:44). In 7:14, 27 it is again a kingdom which is given to the people of the saints of the Most High, when the fourth kingdom is destroyed. Accordingly it may very well be that we should interpret 9:24 "to anoint a holy of holies" in accordance with the usage of the Dead Sea Scrolls,⁵ to refer to a community. The strange statement

¹ In fact the temple building was not destroyed (but cf. 1 Mac 4:48 — the temple was "rebuilt"). Otherwise in Daniel it is the people who are persecuted rather than the temple, cf. 7:25; 8:24f; 9:26; 11:33.

² Both LXX and 8 read "will destroy the city and the sanctuary *with* the anointed (coming prince)", but this is a later interpretation which only compounds the error. The MT as it stands must be very similar to that read by Josephus and perhaps at Qumran, cf. below, p. 460-462.

³ 9:26? 8:11? Or does the passive refer to God?

⁴ 9:26? "Last not least ist aber noch zu betonen, dass es — nach Dan. 9, 27 (sic!) zu schliessen — eine jüdisch-apokalyptische Erwartung gewesen ist, der Messias-Menschensohn werde die Opfer und Speiseopfer abschaffen," H. J. Schoeps, *Judenchristentum*, p. 229.

⁵ Cf. below, pp. 168.

of 8:14 "the sanctuary will be justified (וְנִצְדַק קֹדֶשׁ)" will then refer to "the many" who are "justified" by the wise (maskilim, 12:3). While we do not hear of the temple being purified, it is said that the wise will "refine and purify and make white (לִבָּן)"¹ the many (11:35, 12:10). While this is only a possibility, the fact remains that the defilement of the temple was for Daniel such that it could be cleansed only by being destroyed.

We find no background in Jewish apocalyptic before 70 A.D. for the statement "I will destroy this temple and in three days I will build it." The future salvation was couched in terms of the new Jerusalem, even if the temple should occasionally be presupposed as a part of this (Tobit, Jubilees). Although it might be natural, it is never explicitly said that the old temple must first be removed before the new one comes. On the other hand, the motif of the cleansing of the temple stems more from historical profanations than eschatological hopes, and the future of the cleansed temple is very vague. As the temple was quite unimportant as compared to the new Jerusalem as the realm and means of sanctification, it is possible to think of the temple as coming to an end along with its profanation. This is probably the case in Enoch 89-90, at least a possibility in the Assumption of Moses, the Testaments of the Patriarchs, and the Psalms of Solomon, and perhaps in Daniel. In any case a rebuilding is never mentioned in connection with a destruction as in the temple word of Jesus.

C. Opposition to the Temple in Qumran

The attitude of the Qumran covenanters to the Jerusalem temple and the sacrificial cult is an extremely complex one. As we are given indications not only of their eschatological hopes but also of their present historical situation, it is very instructive to compare the Qumran texts to the apocalyptic writings we have already discussed. Qumran shares with many of them the basic attitude that the temple has been profaned and its sacrifices been made impure, and that therefore the temple must be radically cleansed. As the Qumran settlement was founded as a priestly community in opposition to the Jerusalem priesthood, the historical situation here is clearer than is the case with the other writings. The basic attitude

¹ Is this a play on the temple as Lebanon? Cf. Siphre on Dt 1:7, "Why is the temple named Lebanon? Because it makes white the sins of Israel."

is one of great interest in the cult and therefore opposition to the Jerusalem temple; what effect does this have on eschatological hopes? It was not possible to give a simple answer to this question with respect to the apocalyptic writings; the temple of course would be "cleansed", but in many cases this seemed to involve complete destruction, while sacrifice and temple would not be important in the new Jerusalem. The situation in Qumran is just as complex if significantly different. On the one hand, Qumran seems to be indebted more to the Exodus tradition than to the Zion tradition, and sacrifices are more important to them also in the eschaton. On the other hand, a development seems to have occurred within the sect whereby in fact an effective substitute for temple and sacrifice was found. The concept of the community as the temple will be reserved for a future section, and in the present connection the attitude of Qumran to the cult and the Jerusalem temple will be discussed. Because of a common misunderstanding with regard to the cult, it seems advisable to begin with the older discussion of the Essenes before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls.¹

It is unfortunate that the passage in Josephus which could give us the most definite information is ambiguous, since the crucial negation is found in no Greek MSS of the *Antiquities*. Nevertheless it is possible that we should translate the passage as follows: "Although (δέ) they send votive gifts (ἀναθήματα) to the temple, they do not² offer sacrifices (θυσίας), because of what they consider to be superior purifications;³ and therefore, abstaining

¹ Along with the great majority of scholars we have assumed the identity of the Essenes mentioned in classical sources with the people of the Qumran settlement. This is not to deny the possibility that the Essene movement may have been much broader than the new texts indicate, nor that there are signs of development in the Dead Sea Scrolls themselves. But such divergencies and developments do not seem relevant to our present investigation.

² While οὐκ is not found in any of the Greek MSS of the *Antiquities*, it is given in the edition of Naber, being presupposed by both the Epitome and the early Latin translations. In effect οὐκ is demanded by the sense of the whole sentence, as was effectively and exhaustively demonstrated by Thomas, *Le Mouvement Baptiste en Palestine et Syrie*, Gembloux, 1935, pp. 12-19. Since the discovery of the Qumran texts, Thomas's arguments have been upheld by D. H. Wallace, "The Essenes and Temple Sacrifice", *ThZ* 13 (1957), pp. 335-338, and the οὐκ is read by most scholars. (One exception is Black, *Scrolls*, p. 40).

³ διαφορότητι ἁγνείων ἕς νομίζουσιν. D. Flusser, *Scripta*, p. 230, interestingly suggests omitting οὐκ and translating as a dative of means: "they accomplish sacrifices by (observance of) different purities, which they deem to be lawful."

from the common sanctuary,¹ they offer their sacrifices (τὰς θυσίας) by themselves" (Ant XVIII, 19). If this reading is correct, Josephus states quite clearly that the Essenes do not participate in the temple sacrifices of the Jerusalem cult. As we shall see, this is in accord with what we can learn from the Dead Sea Scrolls. At the same time Josephus states just as clearly that the Essenes do offer sacrifices, not in the temple but by themselves.² This positive statement must be taken more seriously than has heretofore been the case, for it would be illegitimate to weaken it by understanding the first θυσία literally and the second in an entirely different sense. One finds a clear opposition to the temple among the Essenes, but not necessarily, as has so often been assumed, an opposition to the cult as such.

Writing in the last century, J.B. Lightfoot made an excellent case for the complete opposition of the Essenes to all sacrifice.³ Then in 1935 J. Thomas was able to put this Essene opposition to sacrifice as such into the context of the broader "baptist movement".⁴ The tendency has been to read the newly found Dead Sea Scrolls in the light of their conclusions, without ever questioning the basic assumptions they made apart from this new material. Thus Thomas (pp. 13ff) suggests that the "superior purifications" of the Essenes were their common meal and especially their ritual washings. He is followed in this by J.M. Baumgarten,⁵ M. Delcor,⁶ and J. Carmignac.⁷ It may be that all these scholars, forgetting the temple Onias established at Leontopolis, are blinded by the Deuteronomic dogma of the centralization of the cult at Jerusalem; it may be

¹ Although ἐργόμενοι, read here as the middle voice, could be interpreted as passive: "being excluded", there is no evidence or even plausible reason for this, whereas it is clear that the Essenes separated themselves from the temple cult, cf. 1QS VIII, 12f, CD VI:11ff, and Bousset, *Religion* (1926), p. 461, n. 2.

² There is no reason at all to spiritualize with T. H. Gaster, *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, 1962, Vol. IV, p. 158: "they offered sacrifices within themselves."

³ *St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, Macmillan, 1879, pp. 349-419.

⁴ Op. cit.

⁵ "Sacrifice and Worship among the Jewish Sectarrians of the Dead Sea (Qumrân) Scrolls," *Harvard Theological Review*, 46 (1953), pp. 141-159.

⁶ "Le sacerdoce, les lieux de culte, les rites et les fêtes dans les documents de Khirbet Qumrân," *Rev. d'Hist. des Rel.* 144 (1953), pp. 5-41.

⁷ "L'utilité ou l'inutilité des sacrifices sanglants dans la 'Règle de la Communauté' de Qumrân," *Rev. Bib.* 63 (1956), pp. 524-532.

that Christians are naturally predisposed to spiritualize the idea of sacrifice; nevertheless it remains true that the Essenes did offer sacrifice according to Josephus, and that the spiritualized interpretation, while possible, is not the most natural one.

The same ambiguity adheres to two other passages often cited in this connection. Philo (Prob. 75) does not necessarily flatly state that the Essenes do not offer sacrifice, even when he says of them that they are "exceptionally devoted to the service of God, *not because* they offer animal sacrifices, *but because* they think it more fitting to render their own minds holy (οὐ ζῶα καταθύοντες ἀλλ' ἱεροπρεπεῖς τὰς ἑαυτῶν διανοίας κατασκευάζειν ἀξιοῦντες). As Cross¹ points out, this may mean not that they rejected sacrifices in favour of more spiritual values but only that they, in common with all Judaism, held the latter to be the necessary concomitant of the former. It may well be, as 1QS IX, 4 maintains, that the community as such atones "better than² the flesh of burnt offering and the fat of sacrifice"; but this does not necessarily mean that it atones "apart from"³ or even "without"⁴ sacrifices at all. One simply cannot tell from these two passages whether sacrifices are considered to be less important than something else or whether they are rejected altogether. It seems, however, that the opposition in Qumran is not between animal sacrifices and spiritual substitutes (this would have to be more clearly stated!), but between the illegitimate sacrifices offered in the Jerusalem temple and the legitimate sacrifices offered by the sectarians.

There are several passages in the Damascus writing which speak quite specifically of sacrifice. "No one shall bring anything to the altar on the Sabbath except the Sabbath burnt offering (עולה), for it is written: 'except your Sabbaths' (Lev 23:38)" (CD XI, 17f). "If there is no owner of an object to be returned, he who wishes to return it shall confess to the priest, and all shall belong to him (the priest) except for the ram of sacrifice (איל האשם)" (CD IX, 13f). "Concerning the ordinances for free-will offerings (נדבות): no one shall vow anything unlawfully obtained to the altar, and the

¹ F. M. Cross, Jr., *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, Doubleday, 1961, p. 100.

² Comparative מן, cf. 1 Sam 15:22.

³ "à partir de", Carmignac, op. cit., p. 526.

⁴ "sans", Dupont-Sommer, *Nouveaux Aperçus sur les manuscrits de la mer Morte*, Paris, 1953, p. 178, n. 13. C. T. Fritsch, *The Qumran Community*, New York, 1956, p. 108, says sacrifice is "useless".

priests shall not accept from Israel anything unlawfully obtained" (CD XVI, 13f).¹

Various explanations have offered for these passages: 1. the Essenes continued to worship in the Jerusalem temple but did so separately, using the so-called Essene gate,² 2. CD comes from an earlier time than IQS, when the Essenes still sent sacrifices to Jerusalem, although later the concept of sacrifice was spiritualized,³ 3. these laws are provisions for the "marrying Essenes" (B.J. II, 160f), these "who live in camps according to the rule of the land", who are to "walk in obedience to the Torah" (CD VII, 6f),⁴ 4. these laws are purely theoretical, looking forward to the day when the covenanters shall be in possession of the temple,⁵ 5. the meaning is figurative, referring to prayers and gifts to the community.⁶

It is doubtful whether any of these explanations can be upheld. In this connection the passage CD XI, 18-21 is very instructive: "No one shall send burnt offering (עולה) or meal offering (מנחה) or incense or wood to the altar through a man who is impure from any impurity, causing him thereby to render the altar unclean; for it is written: 'The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination, but the prayer of the upright is an acceptable sacrifice.'"⁷ Once more we meet the Qumran conception that prayer is more important than sacrifice. However the detailed regulations of this passage seem to preclude the idea of opposition to sacrifice as such. The reference cannot be to the ἀναθήματα mentioned by Josephus, for the text speaks explicitly of עולה = θυσία. It is not only from Josephus that we learn that sacrifices cannot be offered in the Jerusalem temple, for according to sectarian doctrine the priests in Jerusalem were unclean and the altar unclean.⁸ If these regulations were ever literally applied—and there is no good reason to doubt this—then they must refer

¹ The קדשים of CD VI, 20 may also refer to sacrifices.

² M. Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, Nelson, 1961, p. 40.

³ M. Delcor, op. cit.

⁴ In a sense J. T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*, SBT 26, SCM Press, 1959, p. 91; H. Bardtke, *Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer*, Bd. II, Berlin, 1958, p. 161.

⁵ J. Carmignac, op. cit.

⁶ H. Kosmala, *Hebräer, Essener, Christen*, Leiden, 1959, p. 374f.

⁷ CD XI, 18-21. The last phrase has been changed from רצונו (Prov. 15:8) to כמנחת רצון.

⁸ 1QpHab VIII, 8-13; IX, 4f; CD IV, 17f; VI, 11-16; V, 6f; XII, 1f; cf. Baumgarten, op. cit., p. 142f. That the regulation of CD could not apply at Jerusalem is also shown by the fact that they differ in several respects from the Jerusalem halacha.

to the sacrifices carried out at the altar in the Qumran settlement.

It was first suggested by Schechter¹ that the covenanters really offered sacrifice in the desert. Cross also is inclined "to visualize at Qumrân the maintenance of an independent sacrificial cultus by a hyperorthodox sect",² and Allegro³ even thinks they had their own temple. The animal bones very carefully buried in jars which have been discovered by archeologists at the Qumran site⁴ might suggest that animals really were sacrificed. CD III, 21 - IV, 2 understands Ezekiel 44:15 to apply to three classifications of members of the sect, and if the reference to sacrifice is to be understood literally, it would provide a prophetic justification for their practices: "The priests and the Levites and the sons of Zadok, who kept the charge of my sanctuary when the people of Israel went astray from me, they shall offer me the fat and the blood. . . . The sons of Zadok. . . shall stand at the end of days" in the sacrificial service.⁵

Lightfoot wrote in 1879, "Thus it is clear that with the Essene it was the sacrifices which polluted the temple, and not the temple which polluted the sacrifices."⁶ We now see that this statement must be completely reversed, for while at Qumran the temple was thought to be polluted, sacrifices offered elsewhere were in no sense polluting. This is true whether, as is most probable, the Essenes really sacrificed by themselves, or whether they only hoped to do so in the future. We find at Qumran not an opposition to the sacrificial cult, but specifically an opposition to the Jerusalem temple and a rejection of all sacrifices offered in Jerusalem.

The Qumran covenanters are those of the house of Peleg who "went out of the holy city and leaned upon God at the time of the unfaithfulness of Israel. They declared the sanctuary to be impure and turned to God" (CD XX, 22-24).⁷ "None who have been

¹ *Documents of Jewish Sectaries I. Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, Cambridge, 1910, p. xv.

² op. cit. p. 102; cf. J. Bowman, "Did the Qumran Sect Burn the Red Heifer?", *Rev. Qum.* 1 (1958), pp. 73-84, who answers his own question affirmatively.

³ *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, Penguin, 1956, p. 98.

⁴ R. de Vaux, "Fouilles de Khirbet Qumrân," *Rev. Bibl.* 63 (1956), pp. 533-577.

⁵ According to J. Maier, *Die Texte vom Toten Meer*, Bd. II, p. 47, "stand" (עמדים) is a technical term referring to sacrificial service.

⁶ op. cit., p. 372.

⁷ Translation according to Maier, op. cit., Bd. I, p. 69. Kosmala, op. cit., p. 365, understands as "when Israel was unfaithful and defiled the sanctuary" (cf. Ezek 23:38), but interprets מקדש as Israel.

brought into the covenant shall enter the sanctuary, to light its altar in vain. They shall close the door, as God said: 'Who among you will close its door? Do not kindle fire upon my altar in vain!' (Mal 1:10)" (CD VI, 11-14). "God hid his face from Israel and from his sanctuary" (CD I, 3), because it has been "profaned" (CD IV, 18; V, 6). "The wicked priest did abominable deeds and profaned the sanctuary of God" (IQpHab XII, 7f). The temple has been profaned by violence (IQpHab X, 10) and robbery (IQpHab IX, 4f, CD VI, 16) and Niddah uncleanness (CD XII, 1f).¹ Also Jerusalem is always seen as the place of impurity (CD XII, 2), the "city of vanity, built with blood" (IQpHab X, 10), the city which has been defiled (CD XX, 22). Therefore Joshua prophesied concerning Jerusalem: "'cursed be the man who will build up this city again. He shall found it with his first-born, and he shall set up its gates with his youngest son (Jos 6: 26).'" And see, a cursed man, one of Belial's, arises to become a fowler's trap to his people and a ruin to all his neighbors. . . . Both become vessels of violence, and they have rebuilt (Jerusalem) and set up within it a wall and towers to make it a fortress of wickedness. . . like water on the rampart of the daughter of Zion and in the district of Jerusalem." (4QTest 22-30).

If sacrifices were so important that they were even offered outside Jerusalem, then one would certainly expect them to be an important part of the eschatological hope of Qumran, looking forward to the day when they would be offered in the new temple in the new Jerusalem. In fact, while future sacrifices are often referred to, there is no mention of the new Jerusalem in the sources. It seems that Qumran ignores the entire Zion tradition and returns to the tradition of the wandering in the wilderness of the time of Moses. In any case, one writing which is often quoted to refer to the expectation of the new Jerusalem does not say any such thing. The fragments to which the title "description of the new Jerusalem" has

¹ "A man may not sleep with a woman in the city of the sanctuary to profane the city of the sanctuary with their Niddah." Kosmala, *op. cit.*, p. 363f, interprets in the sense that no sexual activity is to be allowed at all, and since this seems overly severe when applied to Jerusalem, he thinks the "city of the sanctuary" means the Qumran camp. Cf. however Ps Sol 8:13. On the controversies caused by the difference of opinion concerning menstruation between proto-Sadducees and proto-Pharisees, cf. L. Finkelstein, *The Pharisees*, 1962, Vol. I, p. xcviiff.

been applied¹ do not mention Jerusalem at all. They speak of a temple which is measured (cf. Ezek 40ff, Rev 11) and describe in some detail the cult which is carried on there. The altar (מִדְבַּח) is not described as a sacrificial altar at all, but rather as a table on which the bread is placed. These fragments may therefore refer to the details of the future sacred meal of the sect, in a future temple if this is not meant figuratively, but there is no indication of a localization in Jerusalem.

The War Scroll is no exception to the general rejection of the Jerusalem temple. Even if the last battles occur before Jerusalem (I, 3; III, 11; XII, 17) and people *leave* Jerusalem to join the camp (VII, 4), there is no indication that the sacrifices mentioned will be offered in the Jerusalem temple. On the contrary, as the camp was organized according to the pattern of the holy wars of pre-Davidic Israel, the assumption is that sacrifices will be offered on the battlefield. Y. Yadin² has pointed out that the mention of the table (שֻׁלְחָן) at which the priests will feed points more in the direction of the sacred meal than the temple service (II, 5f). Again, the מִקְדָּשׁ at whose twelve gates the chiefs of the tribes serve (II, 3) reminds us more of the symbolic city of Rev 21 than of the temple at Jerusalem. In short, while the Qumran sect may have hoped to offer sacrifice in a new temple in Jerusalem, this is nowhere clearly indicated, and in the texts to be discussed seems to be definitely excluded.

The Jerusalem temple is for the Qumran covenanters only a "house of judgment" (בֵּית הַמִּשְׁפֶּט cf. 1 Pet 4:17), from which the "doers of the law" will be rescued (1QpHab VIII, 2). As for the temple itself, it will be judged and destroyed. The "house" of Hab 2:9-11 is interpreted of the Jerusalem temple: "'Woe to him who gets evil profit for his house; who perches his nest high to be free from the reach of harm. You have devised shame to your house; by cutting off many peoples you have forfeited your own life. For the stone cries out from the wall, and the beam from the woodwork replies.'" (Hab 2:9-11) Interpreted this concerns the... who (or: which)... that its stones might be in oppression and its wooden beams in robbery. And that it is said 'the end of many people'

¹ M. Baillet, "Fragments Araméens de Qumrân 2: Description de la Jérusalem Nouvelle," *Rev. Bib.* 62 (1955), pp. 222-245.

² *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*, Oxford, 1962, p. 200.

and 'you have forfeited your life' its interpretation is: it is the house of judgment whose judgment God will hold in the midst of many peoples, and from there he will lead it up to judgment and in their midst he will declare it guilty and judge it with sulphurous fire" (1QpHab IX, 12 - X, 5). This passage is usually translated so that the judgment refers to the priest,¹ but this is neither necessary nor natural, and the idea of a judgment on the temple is not as impossible as many assume. Even if the usual translation should be correct, still the temple which the priests had profaned would be included in the judgment (cf. also 1QpHab XII, 2ff and CD VIII, 3ff). The agent of God's judgment will be "the head of the kings of Javan" (CD VIII, 11), "the army of the Kittim" (1QpHab IX, 7). According to Dupont-Sommer,² 4QpNah 1 says that Jerusalem "will be trampled under foot by the Kittim" (3) and of the temple that it "will be delivered into the hands of the army of the Kittim" (11f). Like Micah and Jeremiah at the time of the first temple, it seems that the Qumran covenanters looked forward to the temple being "cleansed" by destruction and that they did not expect it to be rebuilt. The reason for this can be shown by one final text (4Q flor I, 1-13).

"And a son of wickedness will no longer afflict him (Israel) as formerly, and as since the time when I appointed judges over my people Israel" (2 Sam 7:10f). This is the house (temple) which (. . .) at the end of the days, as it is written in the book (. . .) "the sanctuary of the Lord which thy hands have built; Yahweh shall reign forever and ever" (Ex 15:17f). This is the house in which shall not enter forever an Ammonite or a Moabite or a bastard or a foreigner or a stranger forever, for my holy ones will be there. (. . .) will appear above it forever. And strangers shall not again desolate it, as they formerly desolated the sanctuary of Israel because of their sins. And he said that one should build him a sanctuary of men, in which they might offer as incense before him deeds of the law. And as he said to David, "I will give you rest from all your enemies" (2 Sam 7:11), that is he will give them rest from all the sons of Belial who make them stumble to destroy them (. . .) as they came with a plan of Belial to cause the sons of light to stumble and to devise against them wicked plans so that they might be caught by Belial through their errors. "Yahweh declares to you that he

¹ But cf. the first translator, H. W. Brownlee, "The Jerusalem Habakkuk Scroll," *BASOR* 112 (1948), pp. 8-18 (p. 14).

² *The Essene Writings from Qumran*, Meridian, 1961, pp. 268-270. The text is so fragmentary that his conjectures are very questionable.

will build you a house. I will raise up your seed after you and establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be his father and he shall be my son" (2 Sam 7:11-14). That is the Branch of David who will arise with the Interpreter of the Law, who (. . .) in Zion at the end of the days, as is written, "I will raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen" (Am 9:11). This is the tabernacle of David that is fallen, which will arise to save Israel.

D. Flusser¹ pointed out that this important text involves a contrast between the Jerusalem temple and the house promised in 2 Sam 7. On the one hand the temple of Jerusalem is said to be desolate even while it is still standing, just as Daniel had declared (Dn 9:27). On the other hand the "sanctuary of the Lord" (Ex 15:17), the "house" which "Yahweh will build" (2 Sam 7:11),² the "tabernacle of David" (Am 9:11)—this is a different kind of temple altogether. It is a "sanctuary of men" (מקדש אדם), where the sacrifices are "deeds of the law"; it is a community "which will arise to save Israel". We shall return to this important text in a later context; for the present it is enough if it helps to explain how the Qumran covenanters, with all their interest in the cult, could look forward to the destruction of the Jerusalem temple.³

D. *Lustrations and Sacrifice*

We have seen how a highly developed interest in the cult could in the case of Qumran and many of the apocalyptic writings lead to an opposition to the Jerusalem temple as such. The cult there was rendered impure and of no avail because of the illegitimacy of the priests, the profanation of the heathen, and the sinfulness of the nation. The original settlement at Qumran seems to have been made up of a group of priests who had resolved no more to "enter the sanctuary, to light its altar in vain", but rather to "close the

¹ "Two Notes on the Midrash on 2 Sam VII," *Israel Exploration Journal* 9 (1959), pp. 99-109. He calls this text (p. 100) the only Jewish analogy to Mk 14:58.

² Note how 2 Sam 7:13, which contains a reference to Solomon building the temple, is simply passed over, cf. Acts 7:47ff.

³ "Die eifernden jüdischen Gesetzesfrommen werden sich bemüht haben, Leute zu unterdrücken, die anderen Lehren huldigten, und Gemeinschaften, die andere Wege gingen, die nach einer Verinnerlichung der Religion strebten und in der äusserlichen Wortfrömmigkeit des rabbinischen Judentums einen falschen Glauben und einen Abfall von Gott sahen, mögen der Hoffnung gelebt haben, dass Jerusalem mit seinem falschen Kultus bald zu Grunde gehen werde." M. Lidzbarski, *Ginza. Der Schatz oder das Grosse Buch der Mandäer*, Göttingen, 1925, p. ix.

door" of the Jerusalem temple (CD VI, 11ff). Although it is not certain, it is probable that the Qumran community, like the Samaritans and the supporters of Onias in Egypt, offered sacrifice on their own, outside the Jerusalem temple. At the same time substitutes for sacrifice were being developed, of which the most important were the ritual washings and the common meal.¹ It is not certain whether or not these lustrations ever completely replaced sacrifice at Qumran; however such was the case in other groups.

Before we turn to a discussion of the importance of lustrations in a number of pre-Christian communities, it seems pertinent to speak once more of the broader context of opposition to the Jerusalem temple. The building of the Solomonic temple was an innovation in Israel, and it is clear first of all that the whole Northern Kingdom was opposed to it. Even in the Kingdom of Judah, the cult was not restricted to Jerusalem before Josiah's reform, and even afterward the famous "centralization of the cult" remained more of an ideal than a reality. The old amphictyonic tradition, paradoxically enough even as it was represented in Deuteronomy, was opposed to a fixed temple building, and the Exodus tradition had no place for a temple in its hopes for the future. All of this was given most memorable expression in the Nathan oracle, which was to become so important in later times:² "Thus says the Lord: Would you build me a house to dwell in? I have not dwelt in a house since the day I brought up the people of Israel from Egypt to this day, but I have been moving about in a tent for my dwelling. . . . Moreover the Lord declares to you (David) that the Lord will make *you* a house" (2 Sam 7:5f, 11). Nathan's protest was continued by the Rechabites, who were not only opposed to a house for God but even for themselves (Jer 35), and it receives final expression at the time of the building of the second temple: "Thus says the Lord: Heaven is my throne and the earth is my footstool; what is the house which you would build for me, and what is the place of my rest?" (Is 66:1).

It is most improbable that this protest, perhaps in the community of the Rechabites, should have survived into Maccabean times.³

¹ On the community as the temple, cf. below, pp. 163-176.

² Cf. M. Simon, "La prophétie de Nathan et le Temple," *Rev. d'Hist. et Phil. Rel.*, 32 (1952), pp. 41-58.

³ As H. J. Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums*, Tübingen, 1949, pp. 247ff, thinks. M. Black, *Scrolls*, pp. 70ff, even more improbably thinks of a survival of the old life-long Nazirite.

Nevertheless an expression of opposition to the temple was there in the older texts to provide a justification for any who on other grounds were opposed to the Jerusalem temple. There were also the Samaritans, who in this respect at least really were what they claimed to be, observers (שמרים) of the old amphictyonic traditions. The Samaritans offered sacrifice on Mount Gerizim, in their temple when one existed (before 128 B.C. and after 135 A.D.), and on the site of the temple otherwise.¹ This practice of offering sacrifice outside Jerusalem was followed by other dissident groups: the supporters of Onias in Leontopolis and, as we have surmised, the covenanters at Qumran. There seems to have been a general tendency for such groups who opposed the sacrifices of the Jerusalem temple finally to come to an opposition to sacrifice as such, the expiatory value of which was achieved through lustrations and the aspect of communion through other meals.

The attitude we are investigating, viz. a high evaluation of the cult coupled with opposition to the Jerusalem temple, which in turn can lead to the substitution of lustrations for sacrifices, must not be confused with the indifference to cultic concerns we find in part of the Diaspora. Jews living outside Palestine participated in the temple cult through payment of the temple tax and through their pilgrimages to Jerusalem. At the same time they were influenced by the enlightened spiritualization of the cult represented by the Stoics.² The combination led Philo to take seriously all of the provisions concerning sacrifice but at the same time to interpret them allegorically.³ This does not really represent a very high estimate of sacrifice, and there may have been some who agreed with

¹ J. Jeremias, *TWNT*, VII, 94 (cf. *Die Passafeier der Samariter*, BZAW 59 (1932), p. 58) claims that there was no sacrificial cult on Gerizim at the time of Jesus, but the evidence he offers (the aorist of the verb "worshipped" in Jn 4:20) is not sufficient to overthrow the older view of Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 1901-09, II, p. 21f. Cf. the statements of two visitors in the twelfth century, the Karaite Judah Hadassi: "They still offer sacrifice to this day, according to the law of Moses, though they have no temple, and it is the priest who performs the ceremonies." and Benjamin of Tudela, "They offer sacrifices and burnt offerings in their synagogue on Mount Gerizim according to the prescription of the law. They bring burnt offerings on the Passover feast and other holy days to the altar which they built on Mount Gerizim." (cited by Max Seligsohn, *Jewish Encyclopedia*, X (1907), p. 624.

² Cf. Wenschkewitz, *Spiritualisierung*, pp. 49-67.

³ Cf. H. A. Wolfson, *Philo*, Harvard University Press, 1962³, Vol. II, pp. 241 ff.

Justin's Trypho (Dial 117, 2), who asserted that "God does not accept the sacrifices of those who dwelt then in Jerusalem. . . , but says that he is pleased with the prayers of the individuals of that nation then dispersed, and calls their prayers sacrifices." However, with all of this rather philosophic condemnation of material worship, there is not a single statement which can be cited from the Diaspora criticizing the temple.¹ The temple at Jerusalem, something like the Queen in the British Commonwealth, was the symbol of the unity of the people of the one true God, and as such it was honored throughout the Diaspora. It is only among those more intimately concerned with the cult that we find opposition to the temple and other cultic, as differentiated from spiritual, substitutes for sacrifice.

The basic interest in lustrations is something the Pharisees shared with other groups. During the period of the second temple there occurred a "democratization" of the cult, a movement led by the plebeians of Jerusalem in opposition to the priesthood and the aristocracy. Thus they insisted that the cost of the daily Tamid sacrifices be met out of the temple tax coming from all the people rather than being donated by the wealthy. This was symbolized by the Maamadot, lay representatives who were attached to each of the 24 priestly divisions and were present at all sacrifices.² The Pharisees went further than this: "The Pharisees and their predecessors insisted that the whole world was a Divine Temple in which each man served as priest. Their rituals of worship at home, in the market place, and in the synagogue were as carefully thought through as similar gestures in the Temple of Jerusalem by the Aaronid priests."³ In particular this meant following all of the Levitical rules of purity which had applied originally only to the priests, so that the meals eaten by the Pharisaic associates became comparable to the consecrated food eaten by the priests in the temple. J. Jeremias can thus define the movement as follows: "Die pharisäischen Gemeinschaften sind also Kreise von Laien, die sich aus freien Stücken zur Befolgung der priesterlichen Reinheitsvorschriften

¹ Cf. B. Gärtner, *The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation*, Uppsala, 1955, p. 205f.

² Cf. Leo Baeck, *The Pharisees and other Essays*, Schocken, 1947, pp. 39f; Finkelstein (note 3), pp. 282ff, 710ff.

³ L. Finkelstein, *The Pharisees. The Sociological Background of their Faith*, Jewish Publication Society, 1962³, p. xxxix. This monumental work is of decisive importance for understanding the origin and early controversies of the Pharisaic movement.

verpflichteten."¹ Not only the priests on service in the temple should be hallowed and separated (*perushim*), but the whole nation should become "a kingdom of priests and a holy nation" (Ex 19:6). This ideal gave to the laws of purity an unprecedented importance. Previously not only the common people but even the priests when not on duty were little concerned about their condition of Levitical impurity, but now the Pharisees strove to maintain themselves constantly in the same state of purity as the priests in the temple. This resulted in the oral laws on the washing of the hands before a meal or prayer or after touching Scripture. However, when we consider that a complete bath was required after major impurities, and that "none may enter the temple court for service, even though he is clean, until he has immersed himself" (Yoma 3:3), we can understand how the most scrupulous would insist on complete immersion every morning (cf. Judith 12:7f).

The whole purpose of ritual washing is to prepare one for participation in the temple service, and this is true also of the Pharisees. "With the Jews, ablution was also required before each meal, inasmuch as the participation in the meal by the members of the Pharisean brotherhood was to assume the same character as the sacrificial or sacred meal, of which the priest could partake only after having undergone the rite of ablution; and the name of God had to be pronounced over it, as was done over the sacrifice."² Therefore, "if three have eaten at one table and have spoken over it words of the Law, it is as if they had eaten from the table of God" (Aboth 3:3).³ With ablutions and the common meals acquiring such importance and the constant opposition of the Pharisees to the Sadducean temple authorities, one might expect to find a Pharisaic opposition to the temple. Instead, we find that a number of reasons "caused them to compromise with the sacrificial cult".⁴ First, the actions of Antiochos Epiphanes made loyalty to the temple an expression of loyalty to Israel as a whole. Also atonement for sins was seen to be mediated exclusively through the temple cult.

¹ "Der Gedanke des 'Heiligen Restes' im Spätjudentum und in der Verkündigung Jesu," *ZNW* 42 (1949), pp. 184-194 (p. 185).

² K. Kohler, *Jewish Encyclopedia*, I (1906), p. 70; Cf. Finkelstein, op. cit. p. 278.

³ R. Simeon ben Yohai; cf. Ber 55a, "as long as the temple stood, the altar atoned for Israel, but now a man's table atones for him."

⁴ J. Lauterbach, "The Pharisees and their Teachings," *HUCA* 6 (1929), p. 121.

And perhaps most important, sacrifice was an important part of the Torah, and the laws concerning sacrifice were to be fulfilled as an act of obedience.

The considerations which made the Pharisees loyal supporters of the Jerusalem cult did not necessarily apply to other more radical groups whose opposition to the Jerusalem temple led them to offer their sacrifices elsewhere. It is probable that it is in these groups which had already separated themselves from the Jerusalem temple that we must seek the origin of those Jewish sectarians who make up the "baptist movement".¹

We know too little about the temple at Leontopolis (in the district Aegyptus c. 100 miles from Alexandria) to be able to show a connection with the Therapeutae. This latter group, described by Philo in his *De vita contemplativa*, is said to have existed in a number of settlements, chiefly around Alexandria (§ 21). They were so opposed to all animal sacrifice that they were strict vegetarians (37, 73, 81), but their common meal of bread and water was definitely cultic in nature, for they abstained from wine "like the priests at sacrifice" (74). Philo tells us nothing about any lustrations, but these can perhaps be assumed from the white clothing (66). Finally we should mention the strong emphasis on the Exodus tradition, with two choroï representing Moses and Miriam singing after the crossing of the sea (85ff).

We know little more than the names of several Samaritan sects for whom lustrations took the place of sacrifice on Gerizim. Epiphanius (Pan XI) mentions the Sabbaeans and Hegesippus (H.E. IV, 22, 5) the Masbuthaeans, both of which names evidently come from the Aramaic **ܥܒܬܐ**, "dip, immerse, baptize". Through Samaritan sources we are a bit better informed about the Dositheans, who also practiced frequent ablutions in place of sacrifice² and "gave up their devotion to Gerizim."³

More interest attaches to the much disputed pre-Christian group of Nasarenes mentioned by Epiphanius.⁴ Beth by name ("observ-

¹ Cf. W. Brandt, *Die jüdischen Baptismen*, BZAW 18 (1910) and especially J. Thomas, *Le Mouvement Baptiste en Palestine et Syrie*, Gembloux, 1935.

² J. A. Montgomery, *The Samaritans*, 1907, p. 215. The new book by J. Macdonald, *The Theology of the Samaritans*, is disappointing in ignoring for the most part all considerations of the cult.

³ J. Bowman, "Contact between Samaritan Sects and Qumran?", *VT* VII (1957), pp. 184-189 (p. 188).

⁴ Pan. XVIII. Cf. Thomas, pp. 37ff, and Black, pp. 66-73.

ants", Aram. נצר = Heb. שמר) and by location (Gilead and Bashan), they seem to be connected with the Samaritans. It is indeed conceivable that they represent the followers of the prophet who promised to restore the tabernacle on Gerizim but whose followers were put to flight by Pilate in A.D. 36.¹ Be that as it may, the Nasarenes as described by Epiphanius have in common with the Samaritans a reverence for the patriarchs, the Sabbath, and circumcision, and a rejection of the prophets and the Jerusalem temple, and in common with other baptist groups frequent lustrations and rejection of all sacrifice.²

Of other groups, the "morning bathers" of the Talmud³ may just as well have been Pharisees as anything else, and the "daily baptizers"⁴ can also not be further identified. The hermit Banus, who "bathed himself in cold water frequently, both by night and by day", could have been influenced by the Essenes, but just as well by the Pharisees.⁵ The fourth book of the Sibyllines, where washings⁶ and the common meal⁷ take the place of the temple sacrifices, may not be directly connected with sectarian Palestinian groups at all, but represent rather a combination of Pharisaic teachings with the enlightened Diaspora criticism of Gentile temples.⁸

J. Thomas postulated in 1935 the existence of a wide-spread "baptist movement" in the lands east of the Jordan before the

¹ Cf. Josephus, Ant. XVIII, 85-7. This very tenuous hypothesis is offered on the basis of the assertion of R. Macuch, "Alter und Heimat des Mandäismus nach neuerschlossenen Quellen", *ThLZ* 82 (1957) Sp. 401-408, that the Mandeans go back to a sect of Nasoraeans who were forced to flee Palestine in A.D. 37.

² They were even vegetarians and had something like the later Ebionite theory of the false pericopes to eliminate the laws concerning sacrifice.

³ טבלי שחרית. Ber 22a, Tos Yad 2:20. Cf. Thomas, pp. 43ff.

⁴ ἡμεροβαπτισταί Hegesippus in H.E. IV, 22, 7. Cf. the βαπτισταί of Justin, Dial. 80, and Thomas, pp. 34ff.

⁵ Josephus, Life 11, cf. Thomas p. 33f.

⁶ "wash your whole bodies in ever-running rivers and, stretching your hands to heaven, seek forgiveness for your former deeds" (165f). For "the whole world shall hear a rumbling and a mighty roar and he (God) shall burn the whole earth, and consume the whole race of men" (175f); cf. Lk 3:16f.

⁷ "Happy shall those men be throughout the earth who shall truly love the Mighty God, blessing him before eating and drinking, staunch in their godliness. Who, when they see them, shall disown all temples and altars, vain erections of senseless stones, befouled with constant blood of living things and sacrifices of four-footed beasts" (24-30).

⁸ Cf. M. Simon, *Verus Israel*, Paris, 1948, p. 57f. After some hesitation Thomas, p. 59, connects them with his sectarian baptist movement.

beginning of the Christian era, a hypothesis which was seemingly confirmed by the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. What all the groups had in common was the use of frequent ablutions and an opposition to the sacrifices of the Jerusalem temple. M. Black has carried this hypothesis of a baptist movement one step further in suggesting that "its fons et origo was the Samaritan schism".¹ This is very suggestive. Even the Qumran sect, originating in Jerusalem, may have developed contacts with similar sectarian groups from Samaria.² Nevertheless, while there are many advantages to Black's hypothesis, in that it shows admirably the development from opposition to the Jerusalem temple to the extensive use of lustrations to opposition to sacrifice altogether, it is probably much too schematic. Of the two groups practicing lustrations about which we know most, the Pharisees and the Qumran sect, neither were opposed to sacrifice as such, as we have seen. While opposition to the Jerusalem temple and the use of baptism as opposed to sacrifice were definitely connected by e.g. the later Ebionites, we cannot assume that this was always the case with earlier groups. Thus the main thesis of Thomas, that the baptist movement always substituted lustrations for sacrifice, cannot be upheld. Opposition to the Jerusalem temple, an attitude shared by the Samaritans opposed to the temple altogether and groups like the Essenes concerned about its pollution, seems to be connected with an emphasis on the Exodus tradition. The use of lustrations comes from a democratization of the cult and may or may not be coupled with the rejection of sacrifices and opposition to the temple. While both of these motifs were so to speak in the air before the destruction of the temple, we know too little about most of the sectarian groups to be able to define their attitude precisely, and we cannot maintain that the two motifs were always conjoined.

The situation in the Dead Sea Scrolls is perhaps typical of the mingling of motives concerning sacrifice and lustrations. On the one hand a priestly conservatism led the covenanters still to value sacrifice highly, while on the other their theology of lustrations

¹ *Scrolls*, p. 74.

² The only real evidence for this are the fragments published by P. W. Skehan, "Exodus in the Samaritan Recension from Qumran," *JBL* 74 (1955), pp. 182ff. J. Bowman, "Contact?", is justifiably more cautious: "Direct points of contact between Samaritan sects and Qumran probably never existed, but both grew out of a similar background" (p. 189).

in effect rendered sacrifice superfluous. K. G. Kuhn¹ says that "the baths had for the Essenes, over and above their old meaning (to secure cultic purity), the sacramental function of mediating in the divine forgiveness of sins (1QS III, 3ff). In place of the sacrificial cultus of the temple, . . . the baths, and apparently also the communal meal, took on a new meaning, mediating salvation from God." The most relevant passage speaks as it happens in negative terms of one who would belong to the community without the proper inner disposition:

He shall not be purified by atonement offerings (כפורים), and he shall not be made clean with the water of purification (מי נדה), and he shall not be made holy in seas or rivers, and he shall not be made clean by any ablution. Unclean, unclean shall he be all the days of his rejection of the ordinances of God, in that he does not let himself be instructed by the community of His counsel. For through the spirit of the true counsel of God are the ways of a man atoned for, all his sins, that he may see the light of life. And through the holy spirit for union in His truth is he made clean from all his sins, and through the spirit of uprightness and humility are his sins atoned for. And when he humbles himself under all the precepts of God, his flesh shall be made clean through sprinkling with the water of purification and through sanctification with the water of purity. (1QS III, 4-9)

What is most significant about this text is precisely its negative quality, its statement that lustrations without repentance, without the spirit of God, are of no avail. This is of course without parallel in Rabbinic statements concerning the removal of Levitical impurity, but it parallels exactly what they say about sacrifices atoning for sins!² Lustrations at Qumran have a moral quality, requiring repentance and confession and restitution, and they have the effect of mediating the forgiveness of sin.

The common meal at Qumran, like that of the priests in the temple of Jerusalem and that of the Therapeutae in Egypt, and to a much greater degree than that of the Pharisaic haburoth, had a definite cultic quality. The whole point of purifying one's self with water,

¹ "The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran," in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. K. Stendahl, Harpers, 1957, pp. 65-93 (p. 68).

² Cf. A. Büchler, *Studies in Sin and Atonement in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century*, London, 1928, pp. 408ff; S. Schechter, *Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*, Schocken, 1961 (1909), pp. 313ff; G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, Vol. I, pp. 507ff.

not only from impurity but also from sin, was to enable one to take part in the meal.¹ Not only does Josephus clearly say that "after this purification they assemble in a private apartment which none of the uninitiated is permitted to enter; pure now themselves, they repair to the refectory as to some sacred shrine" (B.J. II, 129), but it is also implied by 1QS V, 13, which says that the unrepentant "shall not go into the water, to touch the 'purity' (i.e. the pure food of the meal) of the holy men." Thus Qumran found a substitute not only for the expiatory aspect of sacrifice but also for the aspect of communion.

Both lustration and the meal had highly eschatological associations. Just as the meal is an anticipation of salvation expressed in terms of the Messianic banquet (cf. 1QSa II, 11-12), so the lustrations are an anticipation of the coming judgment. The "time of the determined judgment" will come, when "God will refine all the works of man with his truth, and he will purify for himself some of the sons of men, to abolish every evil spirit from the midst of his flesh, and to purify him with the holy spirit from all wicked deeds. And he will sprinkle over them the spirit of truth like the water of purification" (1QS IV, 20f). This eschatological aspect, along with the expiatory quality of lustrations for those who repent, brings the concept of Qumran very close to that of John the Baptist.

In the light of the importance of lustrations in "orthodox" as well as sectarian groups of the time, the endless argument over the origin of John's baptism is of secondary importance. In particular there is no need to derive John's baptism specifically from the lustrations at Qumran,² for they could just as well be an intensification of the lustrations of the Pharisees.³ Nevertheless, John has much more in common with both the Pharisees and Qumran than is commonly allowed. A great deal of confusion has been introduced into the whole discussion by the use of the term "baptism", which

¹ Cf. Kuhn, art. cit., pp. 67ff; Black, *Scrolls*, pp. 91ff.

² There is no need whatsoever to suppose with W. H. Brownlee, "John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls," in *The Scrolls and the N.T.*, pp. 33-53, that he had once been a member of the sect. On the other hand, there is no need to deny the obvious analogies, as does H. H. Rowley, "The Baptism of John and the Qumran Sect," *New Testament Essays*, ed. A. J. B. Higgins, 1959, pp. 218-229.

³ Cf. the important study of N. A. Dahl, "The Origin of Baptism," *Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 56 (1955), pp. 36-52; followed by J. Gniska, "Die essenischen Tauchbäder und die Johannaufnahme," *Rev. Qum.* 3 (1961), pp. 185-207.

from the Christian practice has acquired the connotations of a once-for-all act of initiation. It is true that the initiation of a proselyte into Judaism or of a Jew into a Pharisaic association¹ or into the Qumran community all involved among other things a lustration, but such washings to acquire purity continued to be part of the life of the initiate, and it would be an unwarranted Christianization to put too much weight on the first act. Accordingly we propose to restrict the term baptism to rites of initiation involving water exclusively, and then to ask whether the lustration preached and practiced by John can be called a baptism at all.

It is almost universally assumed that the lustration of John was an unrepeatable act and that this was the main point of distinction between him and Qumran.² This is however nowhere indicated in our sources and in view of the common practice is improbable in itself. As John was not interested in founding a separate community, the act can hardly be called an initiation. It is this non-exclusive quality of John's proclamation that distinguishes him most from the men of Qumran. Otherwise the significance of their lustrations is quite similar to what we know about John, except that what for them is only one aspect of their common life is for him so all important that he is known simply as the "baptist".

The lustration of John is characterized in Mk 1:4 as a "lustration of repentance leading toward the forgiveness of sin." As in Qumran the act almost reaches the status of a sacrament whereby the forgiveness of sins was mediated. Of course only God can forgive sin, and he will do so at the impending judgment, but a voluntary entering of a river of water now as an anticipation of the river of fire to come is a "rite symbolic of the acceptance of the judgment which he (John) proclaimed."³ This eschatological aspect may be especially emphasized by John, but it is very similar to what we have found at Qumran. The roots of both may be found in the Old Testament, where judgment is frequently expressed in terms of the fire of purification⁴ and the final salvation in terms of purification by the

¹ The initiation, involving the promise always to eat one's food in Levitical purity, is compared by Finkelstein, *op. cit.*, pp. 77, to the initiation into the Essene order.

² So recently, e.g., J. Gnilka, *art. cit.*

³ C. H. Kraeling, *John the Baptist*, Scribner's 1951, p. 118. The hypothesis of the river of fire (cf. C. M. Edsman, *Le Baptême de feu*, 1940) has now been strikingly confirmed by the Dead Sea Scrolls, cf. 1QH III, 27ff.

⁴ "When the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of

spirit.¹ Also in common with Qumran is the fact that the lustration of John, according to both the New Testament and Josephus (Ant. XVIII, 116), requires repentance to be effective. This shows that it really does take the place of sacrifice,² that John's lustrations represent the usurpation of priestly prerogatives,³ that the significance of his lustrations transcended those of the Pharisees,⁴ and that he was opposed not only to sacrifices but also to the Jerusalem temple.

The fact that John proclaimed and practiced his lustrations "in the wilderness" is perhaps enough to link him with the Exodus tradition as opposed to the Zion tradition. There are also some interesting links connecting him with Samaria, e.g. his ministry at "Aenon near Salim" (Jn 3:23).⁵ Opposition to the temple, however, does not seem to be the driving force behind John's substitution of lustrations for sacrifice. Simply because of the great importance put on the "lustration of repentance leading toward the forgiveness of sins", it tends to become more than just a substitute for sacrifices and temple; emphasis is put on repentance and eschatology in themselves apart from the cult. Thus while the lustrations so strikingly proclaimed by John could be taken over in a cultic sense by later groups, his real importance seems to lead toward the non-cultic proclamation of Jesus and the once-for-all baptism of the church proclaiming his once-for-all death.

Zion and cleansed the bloodstains of Jerusalem from its midst by a spirit of judgment and by a spirit of burning." Is 4:4, cf. Is 1:25, Ezek 22:20ff, Zech 13:9, Mal 3:3, 19.

¹ "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean from all your uncleannesses, and from all your idols I will cleanse you. A new heart I will give you, and a new spirit I will put within you." Ezek 36:25f.

² This was stated first and most consistently by E. Lohmeyer, *Das Urchristentum, I. Johannes der Täufer*, Göttingen, 1932.

³ Therefore he was opposed by the Jerusalem priesthood, Mk 11:31, Mt 21:32, Jn 1:19. There is no reason to doubt the statement of Lk 1 that John was born of a priestly family and then turned against the temple, cf. Kraeling, pp. 23-27. "Eine Taufe der Umkehr zur Vergebung der Sünden spenden, . . . das ist priesterliches Handeln." (W. Grundmann, *Die Geschichte Jesu Christi*, Berlin, 1959, p. 29) "Es ist priesterliches Amt, Sünde zu sühnen" (H. Thyen, "ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΑ ΜΕΤΑΝΟΙΑΣ ΕΙΣ ΑΦΕΣΙΝ ΑΜΑΡΤΙΩΝ," *Zeit und Geschichte*, Bultmannfestschrift, Tübingen, 1964, pp. 97-125 (p. 121)).

⁴ His disciples get into an argument with a Jew on the matter of καθαρισμός Jn 3:25.

⁵ Jn 3:23. On the relationship between John and Samaria, cf. C. H. Scobie, *John the Baptist*, London, 1964, pp. 163-177. In view of the possible links between the Mandeans and Samaria, perhaps ps.-Clem. Hom II, 23, connecting John the "Hemerobaptist" with Samaria and Samaritan Gnosticism is not simply freely invented.

E. Jewish-Christian Opposition to the Temple

We have been seeking to provide a background for understanding the opposition to the temple expressed in parts of the New Testament. Now it will be necessary to look briefly at later developments within Jewish Christianity in order to ascertain if possible their origin in the early Christian community.

The opposition to the temple of the Ebionites in the pseudo-Clementines is well known.¹ This opposition is expressed in terms of a vehement rejection of all animal sacrifice, but it does not mean opposition to the cult as such, for the fire of sacrifice has been replaced by the water of baptism. A few examples² should suffice to show this basic opposition. Jesus is the "true prophet who was to reject at once the sacrifice and the place" (Rec 1, 37); he "has put out by the grace of baptism that fire which the priest kindled for sins" (1, 48); he is the prophet foretold by Moses who "should warn them by the mercy of God to cease from sacrificing; lest haply they might suppose that on the cessation of sacrifice there was no remission of sins for them, he instituted baptism by water among them, in which they might be absolved from all their sins on the invocation of his name, . . . being purified not by the blood of beasts, but by the purification of the Wisdom of God" (1, 39). Finally, the conscious opposition of baptism to the sacrifices is clearly shown when the High Priest "finds fault with the baptism of our Jesus, as having been recently brought in in opposition to the sacrifices" (1, 55).

Exactly the same attitude toward sacrifices is to be found in the fragments of the Gospel of the Ebionites. Thus Jesus says quite programmatically, "I have come to destroy the sacrifices, and if you do not cease sacrificing the wrath will not cease from you." Along the same line are the vegetarian tendencies, avoiding all sacrificial meat, in their statement that John the Baptist ate cakes (ἐγκρίδες) rather than locusts (ἀκριδες), and the reply of Jesus concerning

¹ Cf. the detailed analysis given by Schoeps: opposition to sacrifices, pp. 220-233, opposition to the temple, pp. 233-242. We cannot however agree with his explanation of the origin of this opposition, viz. from the Rechabites through the Essenes, pp. 247-255.

² According to Schoeps, p. 52, in agreement with Waitz and Cullmann, these passages all stood in the Kerygmata Petrou, but this is not essential to our present discussion and no critical examination of the texts has been undertaken.

the passover: "Do I desire to eat meat with you on this Passover?"¹

It must be emphasized that the Ebionite opposition to sacrifices does not at all indicate an indifference in cultic matters or represent a spiritualization of cultic concepts.² It is not just a question of initiatory baptism replacing sacrifice, but of ritual lustrations to remove uncleanness. Epiphanius in his discussion of the Ebionites emphasizes their practice of lustrations as being especially characteristic, saying that they "think they have purity through lustrations" (Pan XXX, 13), and that they thereby "make use of all the invocations which Helxai composed" (Pan XXX, 17). To a degree this is confirmed by the pseudo-Clementines. Ritual baths were taken before meals (Rec 1, 19; 2, 71; 4, 3; Hom 8, 2; 9, 23; 10, 26; etc.), before praying (Rec 6, 1; Hom 10, 1; 11, 1), and after sexual contact (Rec 6, 11; Hom 11, 30). Not only do these lustrations ignore the statement of Jesus, Mk 7:15, but they go far beyond the Pharisaic regulations concerning clean and unclean.³ We see here undoubtedly an influence coming from the "baptist movement",⁴ or even specifically from Qumran⁵, but the closest parallel is to Elchasai.

The use of lustrations by the Ebionites and especially their opposition of water to sacrifice can be traced back to Elchasai at the beginning of the second century. Epiphanius (Pan XIX, 3) says of him that he "condemns sacrifice and cultic acts, saying that they are unworthy of God; he also denies that they were ever offered to God in the time of the patriarchs or under the law. Nevertheless he has ordained that one should pray toward Jerusalem where the altar and sacrifices had been. He blames the Jews for eating meat and despises the altar itself and the fire as having nothing to do with God. For water is good and pleasing to God but fire is displeasing to him. 'Children,' he said, 'do not follow the idol of fire, because you would err. . . follow rather the voice of water.'" Not only did Elchasai preach his famous second baptism "for the forgiveness of sins" (Hippolytus, Elen IX, 13, 4), but

¹ Fragments all found in Epiphanius and quoted in Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, 3 Aufl. Tübingen, 1959, Vol. I, pp. 103f.

² G. Strecker, *Das Judentum in den Pseudoklementinen*, T.U. 70, 1958, pp. 180f, does not see this important distinction.

³ Cf. Schoeps, op. cit., "Taharavorschriften und Taufpraxis," pp. 202-211.

⁴ Thomas, pp. 173, 181f; Schoeps, pp. 206ff.

⁵ O. Cullmann, "Die neuentdeckten Qumrantexte und das Judentum der Pseudoklementinen," *Neutestamentliche Studien für R. Bultmann*, Berlin, 1954, pp. 35-51; J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Qumran Scrolls, the Ebionites, and Their Literature," *The Scrolls and the NT*, pp. 208-231.

other lustrations were frequently used to cure sickness and to protect oneself from demons (Elen IX, 15, 4-6). It is by the way not only the name ("hidden power") which reminds us of Simon and Samaritan gnosis, and the Jewish-Christian influence seems to be secondary.¹ As we cannot trace the combination of lustrations and opposition to the temple back any further than the very syncretistic sect of the Elchasaites, we shall now have to discuss the two motifs separately.

A note of caution must be inserted at this point against relying on the old Tübingen hypothesis that the views of the Ebionites are those of James and the Jerusalem church.² The historicity of the supposed exodus of the church to Pella is very questionable,³ and it is probable that most of the Jerusalem church did not survive the war of A.D. 66-70.⁴ Even if some individuals did survive the war, there is no reason to connect them with the Ebionites, as Justin, Origen, Jerome, and Epiphanius are always careful to distinguish the Ebionites from other, more orthodox Jewish Christians. We cannot therefore assume the existence of any Ebionite beliefs in the New Testament unless there is specific evidence for it.

The use of lustrations within the church is attested several times apart from the Ebionites and may have been practiced in the New Testament period. It can however never have been of much importance because of the overriding significance of Christian baptism. Because baptism was associated from the very beginning with Jesus' once-for-all death, therefore baptism became a once-for-all act of initiation, not to be repeated like the lustrations. Because Jesus, Mk 7:15, in effect rendered the distinction between clean and unclean and thus the whole cult irrelevant, lustrations never became important as substitutes for sacrifice. There is no inner necessity which could connect them with an opposition to the temple, and thus the position of the Ebionites remains fairly isolated.

In certain parts of the church lustrations seem to have been introduced, probably under Pharisaic influence. Thus the Apostolic Constitutions VIII, 32 commands: "Let all the faithful, whether

¹ Cf. Thomas, p. 154.

² It is unfortunate that the influential book of Schoeps, *Judenchristentum*, continues this hypothesis without adducing any new evidence for it.

³ S. G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church*, London, 1957², pp. 168-173, argues very cogently against the report of Eusebius.

⁴ Cf. the programmatic article of J. Munck, "Jewish Christianity in Post-Apostolic Times," *NTS* 6 (1960), pp. 103-116.

men or women, when they rise from sleep, before they go to work, when they have washed themselves, pray." The source of this usage may be in the Church Order of Hippolytus, which ordains that baptism on Sunday is to be preceded by a bath for purification on the previous Thursday.¹ There is nothing to indicate that the practice is particularly important alongside baptism, although it may well go back to an earlier period.

Lustrations are mentioned in the New Testament only in a negative sense. Thus it appears from the account of Peter's vision Acts 10 that the Jerusalem church had maintained the distinction between clean and unclean up to that point, although lustrations do not seem to have been an important part of the life of the church, either then or later.² Some of the later New Testament writings (Heb 9:14, Eph 5:26, 1 Jn 1:7, Tit 2:14) emphasize so strongly and in such technical language that Christians have been made clean by baptism, that we may suppose that some felt the necessity for lustrations. Heb 6:2 mentions ablutions (βαπτισμοί) as one of the elementary doctrines which must be transcended, so that the practice can be presupposed among some of the addressees. The most obvious reference to lustrations in the church is found in Jn 13:10, "He who has bathed does not need to wash, but he is clean all over."³ In the context of Jn 13 this statement says that the Christian is clean because of baptism,⁴ which is not necessarily in opposition to Jn 15:3, "You have already been made clean by the word which I have spoken to you." In both cases all lustrations are emphatically ruled out.

It is not much easier to trace the Ebionite opposition to the temple back to the New Testament church than was the case with lustrations. The motif recurs constantly as an accusation of the Jewish opponents of the church, but there is no indication whatsoever that the supposed Christian opposition to the temple was connected with their valuation of substitutes for sacrifice.

¹ The passage is quoted and discussed in Black, *Scrolls*, p. 101.

² The motive behind the refusal of the Jewish Christians in Antioch to eat with Gentile Christians was "fear of the Jews", Gal 2:12, not fear of defilement, cf. W. Schmithals, *Paulus und Jakobus*, pp. 51-64.

³ One should perhaps omit with $\aleph$ al. "except for his feet". On the connection with lustrations cf. especially A. Fridrichsen, "Bemerkungen zur Fusswaschung, Joh 13," *ZNW* 38 (1939), pp. 94-96.

⁴ Cf. O. Cullmann, *Urchristentum und Gottesdienst*, AThANT 3, Zürich, 1950, pp. 102ff.

Stephen is accused of having said that Jesus would destroy the temple; we shall examine in a separate section whether or not this charge is justified. What is significant for the present is the fact that the charge is repeated again and again.

Paul was arrested in the temple because of the cry of certain Asian Jews, "This is the man who teaches all men everywhere against the people and the law and this place; he has even brought Greeks into the temple and profaned this holy place" (Acts 21:28). The orator Tertullus accuses Paul of being "a leader of the sect of the Nazarenes, who even tried to profane the temple" (24:5f). Is there anything to justify such a charge? Those who vowed neither to eat nor drink until they had assassinated Paul (23:12f) remind us of the Zealots, and indeed Paul's arrest falls in a time of very strong nationalist feeling. From the Zealot point of view Paul's teaching is indeed directed against the people and the law, even if he should have confined his preaching to Gentiles. However nothing in Paul's letters would justify the charge of opposition to the temple, except insofar as indifference to it might be thought to betray a lack of loyalty to Israel. But on his last visit to Jerusalem, Paul did everything possible to show his loyalty to Jerusalem, and he certainly would have had no reason really to bring a Greek into the inner courts. If there was a pre-Christian sect of Nasarenes who were opposed to the temple on principle, then it is perhaps significant that Paul is called a leader of this sect. In any case, the charge of opposition to the temple is not justified by anything Paul himself said or did, in Jerusalem or elsewhere, but it is made because it is simply assumed that Christians would be against the temple.

That the charge is not based on any particular action of Paul is shown by the Gospel of Peter (7,26), where Peter and the other apostles all hid from the Jews and the elders and the priests, "for we were sought by them as criminals and such that wanted to burn the temple." In Tos. San. 13:5 the Christians are included among other Minim as "those who stretched out their hands against the temple (וְבִיל)."¹ We have already surmised that Mark inserted the accusation of opposing the temple into the account of Jesus' trial because it was a common accusation against the Christians of his day. What is the origin of this accusation? While the relative indif-

¹ On the significance of this passage, cf. L. Gaston, "Beelzebul," *ThZ* 18 (1962), pp. 247-255.

ference of the church to the temple sacrifices would not help to dispel the general prejudice, the charge of opposition to the temple must go back to something more specific than the views of Jesus or Peter or Paul.

When a group is charged constantly with an attitude they do not in fact hold, it is inevitable that they should eventually begin to defend themselves. Thus Mark, who has no interest at all in the sacrificial cult, shows a definite attitude of hostility toward the temple.¹ Barnabas goes much further in his hostility, saying that the Jews "almost like the Gentiles hallowed² him (God) in the temple" (16:2). But the Lord has abolished the temple, consigning it to destruction (16:4). Nevertheless, there is still a temple of God (16:6), namely "the spiritual temple built for the Lord" (16:10). As the end of the chapter shows, Barnabas thinks allegoristically in terms derived more from Alexandria than Jerusalem, but his hostility toward the temple and Israel as a whole shows him to be on the defensive meeting polemical charges.

A dispute between Jews and Christians is the background of the apocryphal story of Jesus in Pap. Oxyr. 840. It describes Jesus taking his disciples "into the place of purity", the inner court of the temple. When he is called to task for being there in an unclean condition, without having first bathed himself as is required, Jesus replies by questioning whether the temple overseer himself is clean. The man replied, "I am clean, for I have bathed myself in the pool of David, going down into it by the one stair and coming up by the other, and I have put on white clean clothes, and then I came and looked at these holy vessels." No, but you are not clean, says Jesus, "Woe to the blind who see not. You have washed yourself in water which is poured out, in which dogs and pigs lie night and day. And you have washed and cleansed the outer skin, which harlots and flute-girls anoint and wash and cleanse and beautify to arouse the desires of men, but inwardly they are filled with scorpions and all evil." Opposed to the kind of purify which comes through lustrations is another. "I and my disciples, whom you say have not bathed, we have bathed in the living water which comes down

¹ Cf. below, pp. 472-481.

² ἀφιέρωσαν H. Windisch, *Der Barnabasbrief*, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, Die Apostolischen Väter, Tübingen, 1920, p. 386f, paraphrases "wie in einem heiligen Bezirk eingeschlossen."

from. . . ." The story presupposes a situation in which the early Christians are accused of ignoring the purity laws, whereby the connection of these laws with temple worship is clearly seen.¹ Jesus replies in a manner reminiscent of Mk 7:14ff, Mt 23:27f, making ridiculous all lustrations. While it cannot be assumed that the story is historical,² it nevertheless accurately reflects the situation of the early Jewish-Christian church in a dispute concerning the need for lustrations. It is interesting how the church is led to go on the offensive, suggesting that it is not they but the temple authorities who are unclean.

A story from the Talmud³ is curiously similar. Eliezer ben Hyrkanos was accused of heresy, and he thinks it is because he once approved of a saying of Jesus. A Christian named James of Kefar Sekanya had said, "In your Torah it is written (Dt 23:19): you shall not bring the hire of a harlot into the house of God. May one then use such money to build a privy for the High Priest?" Eliezer did not know what to answer, and then James said, "Thus did Jesus the Nazarene teach, 'from the hire of a harlot it was gathered, to the hire of a harlot it shall return (Mic 1:7). From the place of filth it came, to the place of filth it shall return.'" The story is very disrespectful of the High Priest and can hardly have been told by those who took the temple seriously. In that Eliezer sympathized with James' attitude, he is typical of the real attitude of the Pharisees in general, but at the same time they were forced into becoming defenders of the sanctity of the temple over against the Christians.

The supposed hostility of the Christians to the temple is not connected with the high regard for the cult associated with temple opposition in Qumran and elsewhere. Indeed, the charge does not appear to be justified at all. There is also no reason to suppose that the New Testament church shared the Ebionite opposition to sacrifice, for the polemical tone of the latter is lacking. Even if opponents of the church should associate the attitude of the Christians with the other critical voices we have discussed in this chapter, in fact there

¹ Cf. A. Büchler, "The New Fragment of an Uncanonical Gospel", *Jew. Quart. Rev.* 20 (1908), pp. 330-346.

² As J. Jeremias, *Unknown Sayings of Jesus*, London 1958, pp. 36-49, maintains. If this story represents Jesus' attitude, as it undoubtedly does, then why should he be in the temple in the first place?

³ A. Z. 16b-17a, printed in H. L. Strack, *Jesus, die Häretiker und die Christen*, 1910, p. 4.

seems to be no real connection either forward or backward. The reason for the charge has yet to be explained.

F. The Messiah and the Temple

Stephen is accused of having said that Jesus the Nazarene would destroy the temple (Acts 6:14). This idea is so strange that most commentators have taken the destruction to be only preliminary to a building of the eschatological temple, even though such a future building is not indicated anywhere in the report about Stephen. We have already discussed the supposed hope for a future temple; now we must examine the specific question of the association of the Messiah with the temple.

J. Jeremias¹ tries to show the close connection between the Messiah and the building of the temple on the basis of the ancient oriental pattern of enthronement and cult renewal. Quite aside from the questionable procedure of deriving Israelite eschatology from a supposed New Year's festival, the passages he cites simply do not yield what he wants them to say. There is no mention of the Messiah at all in the vision of the new Zion in 4 Esra 10, and Enoch 90:28f describes the building of Jerusalem, not the temple, before the Messiah comes.² We have already seen that Jeremias' attempt to understand the entry into Jerusalem and the cleansing of the temple against this background as one unified conception does not correspond with the text of Mark, for the two are not organically connected and the cleansing is not messianic.³ Nevertheless, Jeremias seems to have something in his general assumption, for Mk 13:24ff does connect the parousia with the destruction of the temple, even if no connection can be made between the Messiah and the building of temple.

At the outset it seems that Messiah and temple somehow should be connected. As the first temple was built and maintained by the king, indeed was in many ways a "royal chapel", it seems only natural that the new temple should also be built and maintained by the new king of the end time. In particular 2 Sam 7:13, where it is

¹ *Jesus als Weltvollender*, BzFCT 33:4, Gütersloh, 1930, pp. 35ff.

² Cf. P. Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde*, p. 217.

³ That the entry and cleansing belong together is according to J. Schmid, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, Regensburger Neues Testament, 1958², p. 212, "fraglich und unbeweisbar." He adds, "In der jüdischen Literatur lässt sich der Glaube nicht einwandfrei nachweisen, dass der Messias auch die Erneuerung des Tempels und des gesamten Kults bringen werde."

said of the Son of David, who is called in the next verse Son of God, that "he shall build a house for my name", seems to cry out for a messianic interpretation. In fact the verse is never cited, either in the Jewish or Christian literature, in connection with the Messiah building the temple.¹ This is a strange situation which must be explained. One reason may be that the first temple ended in destruction, and Israel was careful to insure that the second temple was the temple of the whole community. Ezekiel refers back to the somewhat unhappy experience of kings in the first temple (43:6-12) and consequently is careful to speak of a prince (מֶלֶךְ), not a king, in the new temple. The most important consideration, however, is undoubtedly that of the history of tradition. The new temple is usually included as part of the Zion tradition, where there is simply no room for a Messiah.

Billerbeck is cited again and again to the effect that the Messiah will build the temple, and much more weight is placed on his authority than it will bear. In fact, Billerbeck cites only two passages.² Of these Orac. Sib V, 420ff probably does not belong here at all, for the ἀνὴρ μακαρίτης (414) who builds Jerusalem and the temple is called "God who accomplishes these things, God the sender of thunder, the creator of the great temple" (432f).³ One also can hardly put much weight on the second passage he cites, Lev. Rabb IX, 6, where an explanation is being sought for the phrase (S. of S. 4:16) "awake, O north". It might refer, say some, to the exiles returning from north to south (Jer 31:8); it might refer to Gog coming from north to south; or, mentioned only as a third possibility "the messianic king whose place is in the north will come and rebuild the sanctuary which is situated in the south, as it is written, 'I have stirred up one from the north and he has come' (Is 41:25)."⁴

¹ This must be emphasized in spite of O. Betz, "Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein Jesu," *NT* 6 (1963), pp. 20-48.

² *Kommentar*, I, p. 1004.

³ Cf. Volz, *Eschatologie*, p. 182. Or could this passage be by a Christian writer, referring to the Son of Man?

⁴ It is also incorrect to speak as does Bousset, *Religion*³, p. 284, of a fixed doctrine of the Messiah coming from paradise = the north. It is interesting that the building of the temple should be connected with a verse referring to Cyrus, for this is also the case with a passage, Meg 12a, which Bonsirven, *Le judaïsme palestinien au temps de Jésus-Christ*, Vol. I, Paris, 1934, p. 231, wrongly cites in this connection: Is 45:1 is understood to mean that God complained to his anointed against Cyrus as follows, "I said, 'he shall build my house and gather my exiles,' and he merely said, 'whosoever there is among you of all his people, let him go up.'"

It is not clear whether the reference is only to Cyrus or also to a future Messiah.

The only passage which speaks clearly of the Messiah building the temple is the Targum to Zech 6:12f, "Thus said Yahweh of hosts: this man, Messiah is his name, will be revealed and grow and build the temple of Yahweh. He will build the temple of Yahweh and he will exalt its splendor and he will sit and rule on his throne, and there will be the high priest by his throne, and the kingdom of peace will be between them."¹ This differs very little from the MT, which refers to the anointing of Zerubbabel and Joshua only after the temple has been completed, so that it cannot be used with confidence as evidence for the expectation that the Messiah will build the future temple.²

In later Jewish eschatology temple and Messiah belong together, but only in the sense that both are objects of expectation in the new Jerusalem, as in the Tephillah prayer already quoted: "have mercy. . . on Israel thy people and on Jerusalem thy city and on Zion the dwelling of thy glory and on thy temple and on thy dwelling and on the kingdom of the house of David." Never is the Messiah expected to build the temple, nor does he have anything to do with the cult. It is the High Priest, who is to be presupposed even when he is not the explicit object of "messianic" expectation, who will preside over the cult in the future temple,³ which God will build.⁴

¹ Text in Dalman, *Aramäische Dialektproben*, Leipzig, 1927, p. 12. The Targum to Is 53:5 is often cited, but the words "he will build the sanctuary" are a gloss from Zech 6:13, cf. H. Hegermann, *Jesaja 53 im Hexapla, Targum und Peschitta*, Gütersloh, 1954, p. 79.

² The rebuilding of the temple is a sign that also the promise of a descendant of David on the throne is about to be fulfilled. Thus Haggai, in urging that the work of rebuilding be resumed in 520 B.C., promises that when it is completed Zerubbabel will be Yahweh's signet ring and chosen to be the Messiah (Hag 2:23). It is only after Zerubbabel has brought forward the top stone of the temple (Zech 4:7) that he will be crowned one of the Messianic leaders (so the original form of Zech 6:9ff). Actually it is God who builds the temple (Zech 4:6), and not Zerubbabel. The prophecy of Zech 6:12f was not fulfilled, and consequently Zerubbabel's name was even removed from the text. It has in any case nothing to do with a supposed doctrine that the Messiah will build the temple. On Zerubbabel and his relationship to the Messianic hope, cf. S. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, Oxford, 1959, pp. 119-122, 155ff.

³ Cf. J. Klausner, *The Messianic Idea in Israel*, New York, 1955, pp. 513ff.

⁴ Cf. Tos. Taan. 4:10, "what will one say when the temple is rebuilt? 'Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel, from everlasting to everlasting' (1 Chron 16:36) for God alone has built it."

The Messiah, however, is never connected either with the new temple or the renewed cult.

The situation is quite different in Samaritan eschatology, where the function of the Ta'eb (Restorer) is definitely a cultic one.¹ The present is the period of divine disfavor (Fanutha), ever since the furnishings of the tabernacle were lost at the time of Eli. But when the Ta'eb comes, he will restore the tabernacle and the ark, and the era of divine favor (Rahutha) will begin, because the priest is now able to make atonement for sin. This future glorious age when the cult of the tabernacle and ark is restored is described in the sources in terms of a new Exodus.² If we had Samaritan sources for the period before A.D. 70, it would not be surprising to find therein another task for the Ta'eb besides the restoration of the tabernacle on Gerizim. In view of the deep hostility of the Samaritans for the Jerusalem temple, one would expect to hear that the Ta'eb would destroy it completely.

Even outside Samaria there is some evidence connecting the Messiah with the destruction of the temple. Up to the very end the Zealots hoped that the Messiah would appear to save the temple from the threatened desecration by the Roman armies. After the temple was nevertheless destroyed, the Messianic hope reached a high pitch, in the expectation that he would avenge the destruction of the temple. It is probably this second hope that is the origin of the later belief that the Messiah was born on the day of the destruction of the temple but now remains in hiding until it is time for him to be revealed. The exegetical basis for this view is given by R. Abun:³ Is 11:1, "There shall come forth a shoot from the stump of Jesse" follows immediately on Is 10:34, "Lebanon will fall by the mighty one."

¹ Cf. A. Merx, *Der Messias oder Ta'eb der Samaritaner*, BZAW 17 (1909), pp. 17ff.

² Cf. J. Bowman, "Early Samaritan Eschatology," *Journ. of Jew. Stud.* 6 (1955), pp. 63-72. Cf. the pretender of A.D. 36 who assured his followers that when they gathered on Mount Gerizim, "he would show them those sacred vessels which were laid under that place" (Ant. XVIII, 85). Also the prophet of 1 Mac 4:46, who will tell what to do with the stones of the defiled altar, probably belongs in this connection.

³ Lam. Rab. 1:16; jBer 5a. The latter text also says that the temple is destroyed and rebuilt for the sake of Menahem, but this is clearly part of the tradition that the Messiah was born on the day of the destruction of the temple, and it has nothing to do with Mk 14:58, as H. Gressmann (ZKG NF III (1922), p. 189) mistakenly thinks.

The interpretation of Is 10:34 as referring to the destruction of the temple goes back at least to Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai. According to the story, when he was smuggled out of Jerusalem, he greeted Vespasian with the words, "Vive domine Imperator". When Vespasian objected, Yohanan said, "If you are not the king you will be eventually, because the temple will only be destroyed by a king's hand; as it is said, 'And Lebanon shall fall by a mighty one' (Is 10:34)."¹ Here Vespasian is declared Emperor because he destroys the temple, in fulfillment of a different scripture than seems to be meant by Josephus.² The identification of the temple with Lebanon does not seem to have originated on this occasion, for it is contained also in another saying of R. Yohanan 40 years before the destruction of the temple: "O Temple! Temple! Why do you yourself give the alarm? I know about you that you will be destroyed, for Zechariah ben Ido has prophesied concerning thee, 'Open thy doors, O Lebanon, that the fire may consume thy cedars' (Zech 11:1)"³ The identification of the temple with Lebanon is older than Yohanan ben Zakkai,⁴ but of course not the identification of the mighty one of Is 10:34 with Vespasian. It seems that he has modified an older tradition, according to which the temple would be destroyed by the Messiah.

Unfortunately the text of 1QpIs^a on Is 10:28 - 11:14 is too mutilated at this point to give us any certainty. J.M. Allegro⁵ has suggested that the fragment begins with a description of the triumphal march of the "prince of the congregation" (I, 2) from Akko to the "borders of Jerusalem" (I, 11). If so, then "his hand (is against) the Mount of the daughter of Zion, the hill of Jerusalem" (I, 7). Although Is 10:34, "Lebanon (will fall) through a mighty one" is quoted (III, 2, 7), the text is too fragmentary to enable us to

¹ Lam. Rab. 1:5, translated by A. Cohen in the Soncino *Midrash Rabbah*, Vol. VII (1939), p. 102. On the relationship of this to the other version in Aboth de Rabbi Nathan 4, cf. J. Neusner, *A Life of Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai*, Leiden, 1962, pp. 114ff.

² Probably Dn 9:26, cf. below, pp. 460-462.

³ Yoma 39b, quoted and discussed in Neusner, op. cit., pp. 39f.

⁴ Cf. Neusner, op. cit., p. 40, against G. Vermès, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*, Leiden, 1961, pp. 26-39. Vermès lays great weight on the Targum of Is 2:13; 10:34; and Zech 11:1, where Lebanon is interpreted of the nations, but this is surely a later modification of the original painful identification with the temple.

⁵ "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," *JBL* 75 (1956), pp. 174-187.

understand how this particular verse was understood. However, **בִּיד גְּדוּלוֹ** (III, 8) seems to interpret the "mighty one" (**אֲדִיר**) as the Messiah, and the identification of Lebanon with the temple is indicated indirectly by 1QpHab XII, 2, "Lebanon is the Council of the Community", i.e. the spiritual temple. We have seen above that the expectation that the Messiah will destroy the temple would not be out of place in Qumran, even if it cannot be definitely demonstrated.

After the temple was destroyed by Titus there can of course be no expectation that the Messiah *will* destroy the temple. However, there does seem to have been a saying current among some Jewish Christians that the Messiah *has* destroyed the temple. What is involved is of course not a mere reference to Mk 14:58, but the explicit statement that Jesus would destroy the temple, with no mention of a rebuilding. As it happens the only two such statements we have are overlaid with a Gnostic understanding, but the origin of both in Jewish Christianity is clear.

Logion 71 of the Gospel of Thomas reads as follows: "Jesus said: I shall tear (down this) house, and none shall be able to build it up (again)." In the understanding of the Gnostic editor the word "house" refers in all probability to the body as the house or prison of the soul.¹ The saying then is a polemic against the concept of bodily resurrection. However, many of the logia of the Gospel of Thomas seem to come from a Jewish-Christian tradition,² which has been modified to yield a Gnostic interpretation. The "house" which Jesus will tear down was originally the temple, and the statement that none shall be able to build it up again is in conscious contradiction to the double statement of Mk 14:58. This saying is not based on the Markan passage but goes back to a tradition which knew the temple saying only in the sense of a destruction.

Also the Mandeans seem to witness to a Jewish-Christian hostility to the temple. While one can point to many affinities between the Mandeans and Qumran,³ the connection with the Ebionites seems

¹ Cf. H. Jonas, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*, Vol. I (1934), pp. 100ff; *The Gnostic Religion*, Beacon, 1963², pp. 55f.; B. Gärtner, *The Theology of the Gospel according to Thomas*, Harper, 1961, pp. 171ff.

² Cf. G. Quispel, "Some Remarks on the Gospel of Thomas," *NTS* 5 (1959), pp. 276-290; O. Cullmann, "Das Thomasevangelium und die Frage nach dem Alter der in ihm enthaltenen Tradition," *ThLZ* 85 (1960), pp. 321-334.

³ Cf. F. M. Braun, "Le Mandéisme et la Secte essénienne de Qumrân," *L'Ancien Testament et L'Orient*, Louvain, 1957, pp. 193-230. K. Rudolf,

to be closer.¹ A story in the right half of the Ginza, 33 iff,² seems to be derived from Jewish-Christian sources. It tells how Anosh-Uthra "took on bodily form and went into Jerusalem." There he gathered around him Mirjai, Jaqif, Beni-Amin, and 365 disciples, but "the Jews became angry and killed my disciples, who had pronounced the name of life. When I saw them I was filled with anger and bitter wrath against them. I became full of anger and bitter wrath against them and ascended to the great Life above. I told my Father what had happened at that place. . . When he had heard this from me, he gave me a letter in anger; a letter in anger he gave me against the place Jerusalem." The Holy Spirit pleads for the city, "do not destroy this place Jerusalem which I have built", but Anosh-Uthra finally persuades her and destroys Jerusalem with its temple. "I destroyed the place Jerusalem, in which the blood of my disciples was shed. I killed the Jews, who had persecuted the tribe of life. I destroyed the house of those who were without mercy. And Life is victorious."

That the story could well be derived from Jewish Christians is shown also by the fact that the Mandeans knew a version of Mk 14:58. The book of John 76³ has the saying "I destroy and rebuild again, I destroy and found again my temple", and a Manichean fragment⁴ is even closer, "I can destroy this temple which is made with hands and in three days I will build what is not made with hands." To be sure, the interpretation of the saying is similar to that of the Gospel of Thomas, where the temple (or palace) refers to the world or the individual body. It should of course be clear that both sayings represent a greatly modified version of Mk 14:58 and that neither can possibly be used to provide an explanation for it. To suppose with Reitzenstein⁵ and Bultmann⁶ that Jesus refers to the myth of the heavenly man who will destroy and re-

Die Mandäer, II. Der Kult, FRLANT 75, Göttingen, 1961, pp. 222-248, is rightly much more cautious.

¹ O. Cullmann, *Le Problème littéraire et historique du roman pseudo-clémentin*, Paris, 1930.

² M. Lidzbarski, *Ginza, der Schatz, oder das Grosse Buch der Mandäer*, Göttingen, 1925, pp. 34ff.

³ Lidzbarski, *Das Johannesbuch der Mandäer*, Giessen, 1915, Vol. II, p. 242.

⁴ quoted in R. Reitzenstein, *Das mandäische Buch des Herrn der Grösse und die Evangelienüberlieferung*, Heidelberg, 1919, p. 66.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 66ff.

⁶ *syn. Trad.*, p. 127. To be sure, Bultmann lists this as only one of two "possibilities".

create the world is nothing short of fantastic.¹ It may be that the Mandaeans reflect a late Gnostic version of the attitude of some Jewish Christians to the temple, but their writings cannot possibly be presupposed as a background for the gospels.

Our investigation has had negative results. We have found no real parallel to the statement attributed to Jesus in Mk 14:58 in any of the sources. While there is a great deal of opposition to the Jerusalem temple before A.D. 70, only a few questionable passages suggest that it will be the function of the Messiah to destroy it, and it is nowhere indicated that the Messiah will build the future temple. The Samaritan Ta'eb will restore not the future temple but the tabernacle, and it is among the Samaritans that we expect to find the strongest opposition to the Jerusalem temple. This will be significant when we go on to discuss the background of the thought of Stephen.

G. Stephen and the Temple

We have seen that the early Christians were charged a number of times by the Jews with opposition to the temple. The only person whose views seem to justify that charge is Stephen. He is accused of having said that Jesus the Nazarene will destroy the temple (Acts 6:14), and his following speech (Acts 7) does nothing to refute the accusation, indeed it even justifies it. It will be our contention that Stephen represents the climax of the growing opposition to the temple among certain groups within Judaism, and that what for them was only a possibility, that the Messiah would destroy the temple, becomes in the case of Stephen a clear statement.

Stephen is called a 'Ελληνιστής, a word found for the first time in Acts and whose meaning we simply do not know.² The word evidently comes from the verb ἐλλογίζεσθαι, to live like a pagan.³ Apparently it has nothing to do with language or national origin (i.e. proselytes) but stigmatizes the actual behavior of those who call themselves Jews as being in some way un-Jewish. The word

¹ Reitzenstein's hypothesis has been refuted by a great number of scholars, cf. recently K. Rudolf, *op. cit.*, p. 89.

² Cf. H. J. Cadbury in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Vol. V (1933), pp. 59-74. C. F. D. Moule, "Once More, Who were the Hellenists?" *ET* 70 (1959), pp. 100ff, still wants to connect it with language, i.e. Greek speaking Jews. This is the least satisfactory solution.

³ The opposite would be ἐβραϊζεσθαι or the more familiar ἰουδαϊζεσθαι, to live according to the Jewish tradition.

was then of course the designation of opponents, and they would define what specifically was un-Jewish about the behavior of those so designated. In any case the word applies to others beside Stephen and his group, for it was such people to whom Paul unsuccessfully preached in Jerusalem (Acts 9:27), and perhaps with whom Stephen's followers had more success in Antioch (11:20).¹ We shall therefore think of the Hellenists along with Cullmann² as a group belonging to what he calls "esoteric", i.e. non-Pharisaic Judaism.³ Any closer characterization will have to come not from the name but from an exposition of the views of the people involved.

It is frequently maintained that Luke omitted the saying against the temple in his account of Jesus' trial only to insert it into the trial of Stephen in Acts 6.⁴ It can be readily granted that Luke refrained from inserting this section from Mark into his own account of the passion, because he was sure that Jesus had never said any such thing, and because he did not understand the positive interpretation Mark had given to the saying. There is however no likely explanation for the insertion of the saying into the account of Stephen's trial aside from the fact that it was already a fixed part of the tradition about Stephen. It cannot at all be maintained that it represents Lukan theology,⁵ for Luke is not concerned with the destruction of the temple at all. Luke's own attitude is much closer to that enunciated in Acts 17:24, that "the God who made the world and everything in it... does not live in man-made temples." This rather superior and enlightened attitude is quite different from Stephen's violent hostility.⁶ The accusation made against Stephen is not that of having said anything like the content of the Areopagus speech, nor is it the same as the accusation at

¹ M. Simon, *St. Stephen and the Hellenists*, London, 1958, pp. 16f., also points to the Ἑλληνισμοί in Justin's list of Jewish heresies (Dial 80).

² "Secte de Qumran, hellénistes des Actes et Quatrième Évangile," *Les Manuscrits de la mer Morte*, Paris, 1957, pp. 61-74.

³ M. Black, *Scrolls*, pp. 75ff., argues against Cullmann that the link between Qumran and the N.T. church is to be sought in the Hebraists rather than the Hellenists, but this is because he holds to the linguistic meaning of the term "Hellenist". In any case, it seems that Stephen's links are not with Qumran but with other "esoteric" groups.

⁴ E.g. by H. Conzelmann, *Die Mitte der Zeit*, Tübingen, 1960³, p. 154.

⁵ Stephen's speech "conflicts with the basic attitude of Acts" (M. Simon, "St. Stephen and the Jerusalem Temple," *JEH* 2 (1951), pp. 127-142 (p. 127)).

⁶ B. Gärtner, *The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation*, Uppsala, 1955, pp. 206ff; and J. C. O'Neill, *The Theology of Acts*, London, 1961, pp. 72ff, fail to note this fundamental difference.

Jesus' trial. The "false witnesses" said against him, "This man does not cease speaking words against this holy place and the law; for we have heard him say that Jesus the Nazarene will destroy this place and change the rites which Moses delivered to us" (Acts 6:13f). There is no indication whatsoever of a rebuilding of the temple, not even in a reinterpreted figurative sense, but only an expression of hostility to the existing temple.

Except for the adscription of the destruction to Jesus, it seems that what Stephen said might equally have been said by someone at Qumran and even more by a Samaritan. Why then should Stephen be brought to trial for such a statement when others were not? B. Reicke has shown that the death of Stephen must be placed in the year 36, at a time when nationalistic sentiment was on the rise in Jerusalem.¹ It is not just for speaking against the temple but indirectly for speaking against the privileges of Israel that Stephen is put to death. In fact Stephen's opposition to the temple is connected with a missionary motif harking back to the Exodus. "The mobile sanctuary of the early days corresponds with the idea of the ever-onward call of God to His people, the static temple does not."² Stephen must have done more than merely advocate this; he must have already engaged in preaching the gospel of freedom from the law and temple to the Jews of Antioch and elsewhere. W. Schmithals³ presents very good reasons for holding that the events of Acts 11:19ff must have occurred before the trial of Stephen. Stephen's opposition to the temple differs from that of other contemporary groups in that it does not reflect the desire for a more purified cult but is rather directed against the temple in principle.

Stephen's speech, Acts 7, is more than a simple defense to the charges made against him, and consequently it is too narrow to say with Simon,⁴ "The main characteristic is a strongly anti-ritualistic trend, and a fierce hostility toward the temple." It is perhaps better to characterize the speech in a more general fashion with

¹ *Glauben und Leben der Urgemeinde*, AThANT 32, Zürich, 1957, pp. 171ff; *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, Berlin, 1965, p. 142.

² W. Manson, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, London, 1951, p. 35. It is however an anachronism to read into this a program of Gentile mission.

³ *Paulus und Jakobus*, p. 23. He points out (p. 20) that Paul had "zealously" persecuted Christians with views similar to those of Stephen before the latter's death.

⁴ Art. cit., p. 27. Similar is W. Foerster, "Stephanus und die Urgemeinde," *Dienst unter dem Wort*, Gütersloh, 1953, pp. 9-30.

Reicke,¹ "Gottes Offenbarung (war) niemals an das heilige Land oder an den heiligen Platz (den Tempelplatz) gebunden." From the Old Testament Heilsgeschichte Stephen emphasizes particularly Abraham, Joseph, and Moses. Jacob the Patriarch is said to have been buried in Shechem (7:16), against the Old Testament record (Gen 50:13) which localizes his tomb in Hebron. There are in addition a number of other details in the speech which agree with the Samaritan tradition over against the Masoretic text. Acts 7:4 says that Abraham left Haran "after his father had died," which agrees with the Samaritan Pentateuch Gen 11:32 against the MT. There is also agreement with the Samaritan Pentateuch in reading the plural τῶν πατέρων σου in Ex 3:6 (Acts 7:32) and in reading κληρονομία in Dt 2:5 (Acts 7:5).² The life of Moses is described as a type of the one to come, and the prophecy of Dt 18:15 is explicitly quoted: "God will raise up for you a prophet from among your brethren as he raised me up" (7:37). The great apostasy of Israel, to which we now turn, began with the golden calf and reaches its climax in the building of the Jerusalem temple. It is significant that the history of Israel is told in a way very reminiscent of the viewpoint of Samaria.

Already in the wilderness Israel rejected Moses (7:38-43), as they were later to reject the Righteous One of whom he was the type (7:52); already then they rejected the "living oracles" as they were later to reject the Torah (7:53) and the Holy Spirit (7:51). Because of Israel's idolatrous worship of the golden calf, therefore God gave them over to worse idolatry, to star worship, and finally to exile "beyond Babylon," according to Amos 5:25-27 LXX. There are a few special questions connected with the Amos quotation. Although the apostasy of Israel consisted not in offering sacrifices as such during the 40 years in the wilderness, but in offering them to idols ("Did you offer to *me* . . .?"), nevertheless the way in which Stephen refers to sacrifice here and in connection with the golden calf seems to imply that he was opposed not only to the temple but also to the cult as such.³ Second, the LXX of Amos speaks about the "tent of Moloch," but this is not to be

¹ *Glauben und Leben*, p. 134.

² Cf. M. Wilcox, "The Old Testament in Acts 1-15," *Australian Biblical Review* V, 1-2 (July 1956), 2-41; and *The Semitisms of Acts*, Oxford, 1965, pp. 26-30, 159-161.

³ Cf. M. Simon, *op. cit.* pp. 49f.

thought of as having existed in the wilderness period and has nothing whatever to do with the following "tent of witness."¹ Finally, the fact that the place of exile has been changed from Damascus (MT, LXX) to "beyond Babylon" suggests that Stephen is expecting a further dispersion in the future.²

The following contrast between tent and temple (7:44-50) is only loosely connected with the preceding. Here the apostasy is seen in the building of the temple, but the period in the wilderness is seen in a thoroughly positive light, as opposed to the negative progression of the previous section. "Our fathers had the tent of witness in the wilderness", made by Moses according to God's own pattern, and that tent accompanied Israel up to the days of David, who "asked to find a habitation (σκήνωμα) for the God³ of Jacob. But Solomon built him a house!" This is clearly contrary to the will of God, as Is 66:1f shows. This is the high point of Stephen's speech, which is at the same time a plea of guilty to the charge and a theological justification of his opposition to the temple.

The opposition of Stephen to the temple is really without parallel within Judaism or the church in the period before A.D. 70. In one sense he is heir to the criticism of the temple which was undertaken by those opposed to the profanations of the Hasmonaeans, but Stephen goes far beyond anything that could have been said there, especially in the statement that the Messiah will destroy the temple. Except for the general opposition to the temple, Stephen has in particular very little in common with Qumran.⁴ There is no indication whatsoever that Stephen shared their identification of the tabernacle with the community, to say nothing of the later Christological interpretation of the church.⁵ Of course as a Christian Stephen's whole existence had quite a different center from anything

¹ There is no need whatsoever to indulge in source analysis with E. Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, Göttingen, 1959¹², p. 240; cf. Simon, op. cit., pp. 55ff; Reicke, op. cit., p. 153.

² Cf. W. Foerster, art. cit.

³ Although the reading "for the house of Jacob" has good MSS support and would provide a point of contact with the thought of Qumran, it cannot possibly be read, as the αὐτοῦ in the next verse would be deprived of a meaningful antecedent. The contrast in this passage is not temple and community, as in Qumran, but temple and tent.

⁴ In spite of A. F. J. Klijn, "Stephen's Speech — Acts vii. 2-53," *NTS* 4 (1957), pp. 25-31.

⁵ A. Cole, *The New Temple*, London, 1950, p. 42, concludes that "Stephen considered Jesus of Nazareth as the true 'Tabernacle.'" This is to read later views back into the text of Acts 7.

that was possible within Judaism, so that he could afford to be so negative about the history of Israel since Solomon, but it is clear that he did not learn his perspective on the Jerusalem cult from Jesus.

Stephen really comes closest to the attitude of the Samaritans. He agrees with them in his negative evaluation of the temple and of Solomon and in his positive evaluation of Joseph and Moses and especially the prophet like Moses who was to come.¹ It is significant that when the Hellenists were forced to flee Jerusalem, at least Philip thought he would find safety in Samaria. It is probable that he was not alone and that the Hellenists in general were the first evangelists of Samaria, the "others who labored" there.² If there was a pre-Christian "sect of the Nasarenes"³ and if as we surmised this was a Samaritan baptist sect, then surely Stephen must have belonged to it. "His condemnation of the temple is quite independent of Christ's coming and... his position on the matter already existed before he became a Christian."⁴

In the whole of this chapter we have associated opposition to the profaned temple of Jerusalem with an interest in the cult. At first a concern for proper sacrifices, this interest in the cult later came to be expressed in terms of lustrations. Can something similar be said of Stephen? It is clear that his opposition to the temple is neither disinterested nor spiritual, but from the way he speaks of sacrifice in Acts 7:41f it is very doubtful whether he would have advocated the offering of sacrifice elsewhere. While it is possible that he, in common with others who opposed the temple, might have valued highly the frequent use of lustrations, this is nowhere suggested, and it is more likely that he was opposed to all cultic activity as being contrary to the situation of Israel in the wilderness. This is certainly not to suggest that Stephen was a Quaker before his time or even that he shared the spiritualizing tendencies of part of the Diaspora. He speaks much too positively of the "tent of witness" which "our fathers had in the wilderness." R. Eisler has suggested of Jesus

¹ Cf. again the significant statement that Jacob was buried in Shechem, Acts 7:16.

² Jn 4:38, cf. O. Cullmann, "Samaria and the Origins of the Christian Mission," *The Early Church*, London, 1956, pp. 185-193.

³ The Christians are called this only in Acts 24:5, also in connection with opposition to the temple.

⁴ M. Simon, op. cit., p. 100; cf. p. 94: "Stephen and his disciples, having... already rejected Temple and sacrifices, were led to recognize in Jesus the 'prophet like unto Moses' who would restore the religious tradition of Israel in its original integrity."

that what he "in drei Tagen erbauen will und kann, ist ein neues Zelt aus ein paar Stangen Holz, Teppichen, Decken und Fellen (Ex 36:8-38) gleich dem alten Wüstenheiligtum."¹ While this cannot possibly be the intention of the saying Mk 14:58, it could very well have been the hope of Stephen that Jesus would return to restore the cult of the tabernacle. Probably it would not be set up on Gerizim nor would sacrifice be offered there, but it is in the name of the ancient tabernacle that Stephen opposes the Jerusalem temple.

If the closest analogy to Stephen's views among his contemporaries is to be found in Samaria his only successors in the church are the Ebionites. Indeed the correspondence between their views and Stephen's speech is so close that Schoeps was led to postulate the origin of the speech in an Ebionite book of Acts, whereby the original was not Stephen but James!² What Schoeps is trying to disguise is the fact that while Stephen has very much in common with the Ebionites, the same cannot be said of James. James was not opposed to the Jerusalem temple, if we can put any credence either in the book of Acts or in the description of him by Hegesippus: "He alone was allowed to enter the sanctuary, for he did not wear wool but linen, and he used to enter alone into the temple and be found kneeling and praying for forgiveness for the people, so that his knees grew hard like a camel's".³ Although if Hegesippus is right James must have undergone lustrations, there is no indication that he offered sacrifice - James was interested in Israel, not in the cult. According to Acts James too speaks about the tabernacle (15:16), but significantly not of the literal tabernacle like Stephen but figuratively like Qumran. The letter to the Hebrews also speaks of the tabernacle as opposed to the temple, but it says that the tabernacle too was "made with hands" (9:11, 24) and inferior to the spiritual realities which it prefigured.⁴ There are resemblances between the thought of Stephen and the letter of Barnabas, but the differences between them are more important, for there is not a hint of allegorical interpretation in Acts 7.⁵ The only real parallel

¹ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΑΣ, Heidelberg, 1929-30, Vol. II, p. 504.

² *Judenchristentum*, pp. 236ff, 381ff.

³ in Eusebius, H.E. II, 23, 6.

⁴ This must be emphasized against W. Manson, op. cit., who tends much too readily to read the ideas of Hebrews back into Stephen.

⁵ This is not seen clearly by L. W. Barnard, "Saint Stephen and Early Alexandrian Christianity," *NTS* 7 (1960), pp. 31-45.

to Stephen's thought is the Ebionites of the pseudo-Clementines. Apart from Stephen the Ebionites do not seem to have inherited much from the Jerusalem church. Also the resemblances to Qumran should not be overemphasized. The Ebionites have more from Samaritan sectarianism, even Samaritan Gnosticism, than from Qumran. Here too, when we seek to understand Stephen in terms of his successors, we are directed toward Samaria.

Stephen is without parallel in the early church on two grounds: his interest in the tabernacle and the lack of an understanding of the new temple in terms of the new community, but most important his uncompromising hostility to the temple. The person of Stephen provides an answer to the question we raised above: what was the reason for the unfounded Jewish prejudice that the Christians were opposed to the temple? It was not the church as a whole but Stephen who was opposed to the temple, and Judaism applied to all Christians the attitude of the first Christian martyr.¹

Is the saying Mk 14:58, "I will destroy this temple and in three days I will build it" a genuine saying of Jesus? We are now in the position to claim that it is not. The saying simply cannot be explained against the background of a supposed apocalyptic tradition, for such a tradition never existed. We have supposed that the saying came to Mark as a common accusation of the Jews against the Christians. The first half of the saying originated in the hostility of Stephen, who said that Jesus the Nazarene would destroy the Jerusalem temple.

3. THE NEW TEMPLE

We turn now to the second half of the saying Mk 14:58, "I will destroy this temple and in three days I will build it." We have surmised that Mark learned of the saying through the Jewish polemic against the church, but that this polemic does not represent an accurate transmission of a saying of Jesus. We have also seen that it is impossible to find a background in Jewish apocalyptic expectation for such a saying. The difficulty lies in the necessity of interpreting the concept of the temple in the same sense in both

¹ It may even be that the Hebrew name for Christians, נוצרים, goes back to an early confusion with the temple-hating Nasarenes, a confusion that was possible only because of the views, if not the actual origin, of Stephen the Hellenist.

halves of the saying. While there is evidence that some groups expected a new temple in the age to come, this idea is not nearly as important as that of the new Zion, and such an expectation is never connected with the idea of the destruction of the old temple. And while other groups were so opposed to the Jerusalem temple as to hope for its destruction, this opposition is motivated by the concept of a cult without sacrifices, and there is no question of rebuilding the temple. We are forced then to separate the two halves of the saying and treat them separately.

The first half of the saying concerning the destruction of the temple can reasonably be traced back to the group around Stephen. It is however unthinkable as a saying of Jesus in view of his disinterestedness in all cultic matters. Opposition to the Jerusalem temple makes sense only when coupled with a high evaluation of a different concept of the cult, and this is what we found lacking in the first section of this chapter. Jesus could not have said that he would destroy the temple, and Stephen could not have said that he would rebuild it. The opponents of the church were then mistaken in combining the two statements, in assuming that what Stephen said about destroying the temple was compatible with what some other wing of the church said about building it. Once we have separated the two halves of the saying, we may interpret the second half for itself alone. In this case but in this case only it is reasonable to assume that the statement "Jesus will build the temple" is meant in a figurative sense. Could it possibly reflect a genuine saying of Jesus?

There are of course a number of texts in the New Testament epistles where the Christian congregation is spoken of in terms of the temple. It is however not likely that they could have influenced a presumably Palestinian Jewish accusation against the Christians. It will therefore be the task of this section to attempt to demonstrate a Palestinian background for the concept of the community as the temple and even if possible to trace it back to Jesus himself. The leading authority on the subject one generation ago would have declared our undertaking to be impossible. After a detailed exposition of the idea of a "spiritualization" of the temple in Judaism, the Hellenistic world, and the New Testament, H. Wenschkewitz¹

¹ *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe: Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament*, Angelos-Beiheft 4, Leipzig, 1932, p. 113f.

came to the conclusion "1. dass im Spätjudentum Palästinas Versuche zur Spiritualisierung des Tempelbegriffes nicht nachweisbar sind, so dass dann eine Vorarbeit für die christliche Spiritualisierung geleistet wäre. 2. Im palästinensischen Urchristentum und bei Jesus treffen wir den Gedanken nicht, dass die Gemeinde der endzeitliche Tempel ist. 3. Der Gedanke ist also erst nachweisbar, als das Christentum griechischen Boden betreten hat und z.T. in einer Form, die an hellenistische Spiritualisierungsversuche nahe herankommt." The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls has rendered Wenschkewitz' first conclusion completely obsolete, so that also the second and third need to be re-examined. Since the beginning of the present study, B. Gärtner¹ has recently provided us with just such a re-examination. His demonstration of the parallels between the community as the temple in the New Testament epistles and Qumran is so thorough that we shall refer readers to his work for exegetical details. On the other hand, we shall have to disagree with his interpretation of the synoptic evidence and with some of his conclusions concerning the concept.

A. *The Community as the Temple in Qumran*

One of the most important texts in which the community of Qumran is seen as the temple, the dwelling place of God, is 4 Qflor I, 1-13.

1 "And a son of wickedness will no longer afflict him (Israel) as
 2 formerly, and as since the time when I appointed judges over my
 3 people Israel" (2 Sm 7:10f). This is the house which (...) at the end
 4 of the days, as it is written in the book (...) "the sanctuary of the
 5 Lord which thy hands have built; Yahweh shall reign forever and
 6 ever" (Ex 15:17f). This is the house in which shall not enter forever
 7 an Ammonite or a Moabite or a bastard or a foreigner or a stranger
 8 forever, for my holy ones will be there. (...) will appear above it
 9 forever. And strangers will not again desolate it, as they formerly
 10 desolated the sanctuary of Israel because of their sins. And he said
 11 that one should build him a sanctuary of men, in which they might
 12 offer as incense before him deeds of the law. And as he said to David,
 13 "I will give you rest from all your enemies" (2 Sm 7:11), that is he will
 14 give them rest from all the sons of Belial who make them stumble
 15 to destroy them (...) as they came with a plan of Belial to cause the sons of
 16 light to stumble and to devise against them wicked plans so that they

¹ *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament*, Cambridge, 1965; cf. also H. Kosmala, *Hebräer — Essener — Christen*, Leiden, 1959, pp. 363-378.

10 might be caught by Belial through their errors. "Yahweh declares to
 you that he will build you a house. I will raise up your seed after
 11 you and establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be his
 father and he shall be my son" (2 Sm 7:11-14). That is the Branch of
 David who will arise with the interpreter of the law, who (...) in
 12 Zion at the end of the Days, as it is written, "I will raise up the
 13 booth of David that is fallen" (Am 9:11). This is the booth of David
 that is fallen, which will arise to save Israel.¹

This text is an exposition of the promise of Nathan 2 Sm 7, and it interprets the "house" which God promised to build for David as the Qumran community. The community as the temple is the place where the holy ones, the angels, are present, and perhaps the place above which God himself will appear. Therefore it is holy, and the laws which applied to the priests in the Jerusalem temple apply all the more to the members of the Qumran community. Just as in the Zion tradition the city or temple of God could not be harmed as long as the divine presence was within it, so here the community stands under divine protection, and not even Belial will be able to prevail against it. The community is unmistakably called a "temple made of men" (מקדש אדם), who offer as sacrifices deeds of the law.

Strictly speaking, the text is not a *florilegium* but a commentary on one specific text, 2 Sm 7, where individual verses are elucidated by other citations.² Thus the statement in 2 Sm 7:10f that Israel will be secure from affliction by a "son of wickedness" is explained by saying on the basis of Ex 15:17f that Israel (Qumran) will be like a temple. The whole context is instructive: "Thou wilt bring him (thy people) in and plant him on the mountain of thy inheritance, the place for thy dwelling which thou hast made, Yahweh, the sanctuary of the Lord which thy hands have established. Yahweh will reign for ever and ever." The rather usual מקדש אדוני is interpreted as a "temple of men", and into this temple, in accordance with Dt 23:2f, no bastard or Ammonite or Moabite shall enter. This exclusivity (4QFlor adds the "foreigner" in general) is the negative side of the fact that the community is a holy place, for anyone who comes into the community comes into the presence of

¹ Translated according to the text published by Y. Yadin, "A Midrash on 2 Sam. vii and Ps. i-ii (4QFlorilegium)," *Isr. Explor. Journ.* 9 (1959), 95-98.

² Cf. W. R. Lane, "A New Commentary Structure in 4QFlorilegium," *JBL* 78 (1959), 343-346.

angels and the Shekinah of the holy God.¹ Positively this conception calls for the members of the community to be themselves holy and to offer spiritual sacrifices, they becoming themselves in a sense builders of the temple. As we have seen, the conception of spiritual sacrifices lies near at hand from the conception of the community as temple, and it does not necessarily imply a concomitant rejection of actual sacrifices, even though in fact most of the *raison d'être* for real sacrifice has disappeared. The holiness of the community, the presence of God there, also means the divine protection against all the forces of Belial, so that the community will stand for ever. This is read into the next verse of the text, 2 Sm 7:11, in the promise of rest from all enemies. 2 Sm 7 is being consistently interpreted of the community as the temple, with the help of other citations the writer of the midrash thought would elucidate something in the basic text. We should expect this understanding to continue throughout the exposition.

The basic text, Nathan's prophecy, makes extensive use of the ambiguity of the word בית, which can mean either "house, temple" or "family, dynasty". In 2 Sm 7:11-14, cited here in abbreviated form, it is the latter meaning which was intended, but 4Qflor in accordance with the foregoing must interpret the promise of Yahweh to build a house in terms of the establishment of the community of Qumran. On the other hand, we have the consideration that the basic text speaks of the "seed" of David, the "throne" of whose "kingdom" God will establish, and who shall be the "son" of God. Not only does the basic text point toward a Messianic understanding, but the interpretation seems to confirm it when it states explicitly of the son: "that is the Branch of David who will arise with the interpreter of the law (דורש התורה)." If the former is to be identified with the Davidic Messiah, the Messiah of Israel, then the latter represents perhaps the priestly Messiah, the Messiah of Aaron. Otherwise no messianic interpretation of the passage "he shall be my son" was known, and before the publication of this scroll, W.G. Kümmel² could flatly deny that "Son of God" was ever a title of the Messiah in pre-Christian Judaism. This text could therefore

¹ On the importance of this concept in Qumran, cf. F. Nötscher, "Heiligkeit in den Qumranschriften," *Rev. Qum.* 2 (1960), 163-181; 3 (1960), 315-344.

² "Das Gleichnis von den bösen Weingärtnern (Mark. 12.1-9)," *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne* (Mélanges M. Goguel), Neuchâtel, 1950, pp. 120-31.

become very important, and given this understanding it is rightly held to be so by O. Betz,¹ who makes it the basis for a new understanding of the Messianic consciousness of Jesus. However, this whole reconstruction of the two Messiahs rests on rather shaky foundations, quite apart from the atomistic way in which it interprets 4Qflor. Accordingly we shall seek along with Gärtner² to find a consistent communal interpretation also of the exposition of 2 Sm 7:11-14.

The common understanding of the Son of God was that it referred to Israel as a whole,³ and the "Interpreter of the Law" otherwise seems to be not an eschatological figure but the founder of the community (CD VI, 7; VII, 18). Along with the Interpreter arises then not a Davidic Messiah but a community, which can be called Son of God. It seems at first very strange that the community should be called the Branch (צמח) of David, but when we consider the root meaning and the frequent use of the image of planting at Qumran, it is at least a possibility; cf. CD I, 7, where God "let sprout (ויצמח) from Israel and from Aaron the root of a planting (שורש מטעה)." That the designation seemed even to the author himself a bit strange is perhaps shown by the fact that he brings in a proof text, Amos 9:11. While this text too was originally a Messianic text, it also contains the concept of the booth and, as the LXX shows, this booth is very similar to the tabernacle (משכן) of the wilderness, which as the dwelling place of God is in turn related to the temple, which brings us back to the original theme of the exposition of 2 Sm 7.

Amos 9:11f presupposes the fall of Jerusalem 586 B.C. and promises that God will restore the Davidic dynasty. It is unclear why it uses the unusual "booth of David" instead of the normal "house of David"; perhaps it indicates the present modest situation of the fallen dynasty. In any case, the Amos text too speaks of a dwelling of David, and if the house of 2 Sm 7 is interpreted as the temple-community, it is very likely that the booth of Amos 9 should have been also. The same text is cited CD VII, 14-19, where it seems that we also have a collective interpretation: "'And I will exile

¹ "Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein Jesu," *NT* 6 (1963), 20-48.

² *Temple*, pp. 35-42.

³ O. Cullmann, *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments*, Tübingen, 1957, pp. 279-281.

the סוכה of your king and the *Chiyun* of your images beyond the tents of Damascus' (Am 5:26). The books of the Torah are the booth (סוכה) of the king, as he said, 'And I will raise up the booth of David that is fallen' (Am 9:11). The 'king' is the congregation, and the '*Chiyun* of the images' are the books of the prophets whose words Israel despised, and the 'star' (also from Am 5:26) is the Interpreter of the Law who comes to Damascus. . . ' If we can make any sense out of this allegorical forest, it may be something like this: the Interpreter of the Law (the star) goes to Damascus with the community (the king) and the true Torah (the booth) and the prophets (*Chiyun*). The "booth of David" of Am 9:11 is here interpreted as the Torah of the community. Along with the identification of king (Messiah?) and community, the correct doing of the Torah here is quite similar to the "deeds of the Torah" offered as sacrifice in the sanctuary of men in 4Qflor. It is then likely that Am 9:11 also in 4Qflor refers to the faithful community which God raises up along with the Interpreter of the Law.

This collective understanding of Amos 9:11f is indirectly supported by the Targum, which here as often offers a compromise between two divergent interpretations: "At that time I will raise up the kingdom of the house of David which is fallen and I will build their cities and establish their congregations, and you (the Messiah) will rule in all the kingdom and you will finish and protect the camp, and she will be built and founded as in the days of old, in order that the house of Israel, over whom my name is called, may take possession of the rest of Edom and all the peoples, for I am YWY who does this."¹ Here is evidence that the raising up of the fallen booth of David was interpreted of 1. the bringing of the Messiah, or of 2. the rebuilding of Israel, seen in terms of the exodus tradition as a camp. The Targum unites both conceptions by saying that 1. God will raise up the Messiah, and 2. the Messiah will raise up and build Israel.

We have then good reason for supposing that in Qumran the booth of David represents the community as the temple. The house of 2 Sm 7 is equated with the son² of the same text. This son is

¹ Translated from A. Sperber, ed., *The Bible in Aramaic; III. The Latter Prophets according to Targum Jonathan*, Leiden, 1962, p. 432f.

² Gärtner, *Temple*, p. 40, points out that the text goes on to interpret also the "anointed of the Lord" of Ps 2:2 collectively, and he wonders whether they gave a similar explanation to Vs 7 of the same psalm. As the text becomes so fragmentary and our interest is more in the Qumran under-

then identified 1. with the Branch of David, and 2. with the booth of David. Finally, this house-son-branch-booth, which is the Qumran community understood as the temple, can be said to exist in order "to save Israel."

IQS VIII, 1-10 is another very important temple text:

1 In the council of the community (there shall be) twelve men and
 2 three priests, perfect in everything revealed in the whole law, in
 order to do truth, righteousness, justice, love of mercy, and a humble
 3 walking each with his neighbor; to preserve faithfulness in the land
 through a mind stayed (on God, Is 26:3) and a broken spirit; to
 4 atone for iniquity through doing justice and enduring the distress of
 the refiner's crucible; and to walk with all men in the measure of
 truth and the observance of the time. When these things happen in
 5 Israel, the council of the community will be established in truth as
 an eternal planting, a sanctuary for Israel and a foundation of the
 6 holy of holies for Aaron, truthful witnesses for judgment and chosen
 7 by grace, to atone for the land and bring retribution to the wicked.
 8 This is the tested wall, the precious cornerstone, whose foundations
 shall not tremble nor yield from their place. It is a dwelling of the
 9 holy of holies for Aaron, in all knowledge of the covenant of justice,
 to offer a pleasing odor (to God). It is a house of perfection and truth
 10 in Israel, to establish the covenant according to eternal laws. They
 are acceptable (before God) to atone for the land and to pass judgment
 on the wicked, so that there is no more unrighteousness.

It is not sure whether this text speaks only of a council of twelve men and three priests or of the community as a whole, but the latter seems more probable.¹ The community is called both a planting and a temple, and the latter image is divided into the main sanctuary and the holy of holies, corresponding to the common Qumran division of laity (Israel) and priesthood (Aaron). Again we hear of spiritual sacrifices, whereby the community functions as atonement for Israel but judgment for the wicked. The background for these statements is of considerable interest.

There is considerable evidence that the community of Qumran understood itself not only in general in terms of the exodus tradition of Deutero-Isaiah but even specifically in terms of the suffering servant.² The main difference is that while the Qumran texts can

standing of the temple than that of the Son of God, we have discussed only the exposition of 2 Sm 7 in 4Qflor.

¹ Cf. IQS VI, 10; VII, 2, 22; and A. R. C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning*, Philadelphia, 1966, pp. 210-212.

² Cf. J. V. Chamberlain, "Toward a Qumran Soteriology," *NT* 3 (1959), 305-313; and the works cited below, p. 381.

speak of suffering leading to purification, the concept of atonement is then immediately expressed in terms of the community as the temple. To begin with the former, line 4 says that the community will atone for iniquity by doing justice and through "the distress of the crucible (מַצְרֵה)", or with a different pointing, "of the refiner (מַצְרֵה)." The image of refining for purification through suffering seems to go back to Is 48:10, "Behold, I have refined you (צִרְפֹּתִיךָ) ... I have tried you in the furnace of affliction," a conception also taken up by Dn 11:35, "some of the wise will fall, to refine (לְצַרֵּה) and purify and whiten them." It is probable that Daniel is speaking of the wise in terms derived from the Israel Deutero-Isaiah described as a servant, and that Qumran has a similar self-understanding. Israel is addressed in Is 43:10 as "You are my witnesses, says the Lord, and my servant whom I have chosen," which is directly reflected in the council being called "truthful witnesses for judgment and chosen by grace." When the purpose of their being witnesses and chosen is given as "to atone for the land," we cannot help but recall Is 53. At the same time the accent has been decisively shifted. Even if Israel as the Son of Man suffers in Dn 7, the main emphasis is on the statement that this Son of Man "is given authority and glory and kingdom." The Qumran understanding goes one step further when they claim that they have also been given the task of judgment: the council is called not only "to atone for the land" but also "to bring retribution to the wicked," a conception all the more startling when we consider that these very words are found in Ps 94:2 in reference to the judgment of God. That the conception is not an isolated one is shown by 1QpHab V, 4-6, "God has given into the hands of his elect judgment over all peoples, and through the chastisement of those who kept his commandments in the time of distress shall all the wicked of his people expiate their guilt." Behind such expressions lies a long process of development in the self-understanding of Israel.

Even if the atoning work of the community is ultimately derived from the Isaianic servant, the terms in which it is expressed come from the concept of the temple. The community is the temple not only as the dwelling place of God, but it also fulfils the function of atonement effected by the sacrifices of the Jerusalem temple, just as it fulfils the judgment which in the Old Testament tradition goes out from Zion. The temple can be described as a sanctuary (בֵּית קֹדֶשׁ), a foundation (יְסוֹד) or dwelling (מֵעוֹן) of the holy of

holies, and a house of perfection and truth. If in 4Qflor it was the aspect of the presence of God which was predominant in calling the Qumran community the temple, here it is the function of atonement and judgment. That this is not an isolated conception can be shown by two more passages from 1QS, V, 5-7 and IX, 3-6:

5 In the community let everyone circumcize the foreskin of his evil
inclination and his stiff neck, to found a foundation of truth for
6 Israel, for the community of the eternal covenant, to atone for all who
offer themselves for a sanctuary in Aaron and a house of truth in
Israel, and for those who join themselves to the community, but for
7 decision and judgment to condemn all who transgress the command-
ment.

3 When these things happen in Israel according to all these prescript-
4 ions, for a foundation of the holy spirit, for eternal truth, to atone for
the guilt of rebellion and the unfaithfulness of sin, for grace for the
land more than the flesh of burnt offering and the fat of sacrifice—for
5 the rightful offering of the lips is like a pleasing odor of righteousness
and perfect deportment is like an acceptable free-will offering—at
6 that time the men of the community shall separate themselves as a
sanctuary for Aaron, to be united as a holy of holies and a house of
the community for those in Israel who walk in perfection.¹

Here we find still more expressions for the community as the temple. In the light of 1 Tim 3:15 where the church is a foundation of the truth, and the Johannine usage where Jesus is the truth, it is especially interesting to see how closely the concept *אמת* is connected with the temple. The community-temple is called 1QS V, 5f a "foundation of truth" and a "house of truth" (as in 1QS VIII, 5, 9 it is "established in truth" as a "house of perfection and truth") and in 1QS IX, 3f a "foundation of the holy spirit for eternal truth", whereby the idea of the Holy Spirit laying the foundation (?) is especially interesting. It is not just the temple image which is applied to the community but the temple as seen in terms of an extensively developed Zion tradition. Is 2:3 would be understood as "Out of Qumran (not Zion) shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Qumran (not Jerusalem)." Insofar as the Old Testament Zion tradition includes such concepts as the return of Paradise with the

¹ Cf. also 1QSa I, 1-3, "This is the rule for the whole congregation of Israel at the end of days when they shall be gathered in a community to walk according to the judgment of the sons of Zadok and the men of their covenant who have turned from walking in the way of the people. They are the men of his council who have obeyed his covenant in the midst of wickedness in order to atone for the land."

tree of life and the streams of living water, the community can be called not only a building but also a planting (1QS VIII, 4). Although evidence of this combination can be found also in the New Testament (e.g. Rev 22:1f), we shall not explore it any further here,¹ as it is not sure that it would be relevant. It is not always easy to distinguish between the concepts of the temple and Paradise and the mere use of the common word-pair "build and plant". Much more important for our purposes is the firmness of the community established on the rock. This is expressed in 1QS VIII in terms derived from Is 28:16. The same passage is used in two passages of the hymns, 1QH VI, 24-28, and VII, 8-9:

24 And the primeval waters roared at my groaning, and my soul
25 reached to the gates of death. And I was like one who goes into a
fortified city and who takes refuge behind a high wall for rescue. And
26 I rejoiced in thy truth, my God, for thou hast set the foundation on
a rock, and the beam by the line of justice and the plummet of truth,
27 in order to try the tested stones, to build a strong wall, which will
not tremble. And everyone who goes into it will not stagger, for a
28 stranger will not go into its gates, shielding gates, so that no one shall
go in, and strong bars that will not be broken.

8 Thou hast set me like a strong tower, like a high wall, and hast
9 established my building on the rock, and eternal foundations for my
foundation, and all my walls are a tested wall, which will not tremble.

1QS VIII speaks unmistakably of the congregation as the temple; the temple is not mentioned explicitly in the two passages from 1QH but the same basic text is used, Is 28:16f. In context the hymn writer tells how he is persecuted by his enemies but preserved by God. Here especially we see how the hymns reflect not so much the experience of an individual as they do that of the whole community. Indeed it may even be that the "I" of the hymn represents not an individual sharing the experience of the community but the community itself speaking as a unit. It is therefore probable that also in the two hymn passages the concept of the community as the temple is presupposed. The use of Is 28 is definitely the same in all three cases. The Qumran understanding of the passage comes close to that intended by Isaiah, and what is emphasized is the divine protection of the community, which will stand firm against

¹ Cf. J. Jeremias, *Golgotha*, Angelos-Beiheft 1, Leipzig, 1926, pp. 52ff; J. Maier, *Die Texte vom Toten Meer, II Anmerkungen*, München, 1960, pp. 89-92, 96-101; and Gärtner, *Temple*, p. 28.

all onslaughts. The variations from the Isaiah text can be explained in terms of the particular application of the image to the community. Thus when Isaiah speaks of laying a foundation in Zion, this is modified to "on the rock" in order to apply it more clearly to the Qumran community and not to Jerusalem. Where Isaiah speaks of "a tested stone", all three passages speak of "a tested wall", but 1QH VI mentions in addition "tested stones". The concept is of a community made up of individuals, a wall made up of stones. It is also probable that by the "wall" is meant the large stones of the foundation. The inscription on the cornerstone in Isaiah is "he who trusts will not yield (יחיש)"; this word is doubled in 1QS VIII, "will not tremble nor yield" and the hymn passages say only "will not tremble" (Hithpalp. of זעזע). This is puzzling until we turn to the Targum, when we see that the Isaiah reading has been merely clarified by doubling or substitution. The Targum reads: "the righteous who trust in these things shall not tremble (זרעזען) when distress comes." That Qumran does not mention the believer has again to do with their application to the divinely established and protected community. We shall return to these important passages when discussing the rock and the foundation in the New Testament.¹

The very fullness of expression used to designate the community as the temple should make us beware of seeking any allegorical correspondences. For example, it would be a mistake to say that the priests of the community always are represented by the holy of holies, while the lay members are the sanctuary, even if the expression of 1QS VIII seems to suggest this. We also cannot ask which groups of people are to be sought among the foundation stones and which among the stones of the superstructure. This can be shown by another foundation passage 1QS I, 12, which says of every member of the community that "when he is 25 years old he will come to take his place in the foundations (ביסודות) of the holy congregation." H. Neil Richardson² would even translate "take his place among the pillars of the holy congregation," a translation

¹ O. Betz, "Felsenmann und Felsengemeinde (Eine Parallele zu Mt 16.17-19 in den Qumranpsalmen)", *ZNW* 48 (1957), 49-77, § 6, wants to connect the כפיס, beam, of 1QH VI with the name Cephas and to translate both as στεῦλος. It is unnecessary to drag in such improbable parallels when so many real ones exist.

² "Some Notes on 1QSa," *JBL* 76 (1957), 108-122, p. 111.

which is possible but not necessary. In any case there is no real contradiction to 1QS VII, 17, "he who has murmured against the foundation of the community shall be sent away." Completely apart from a possible interchangeability between יסוד "foundation" and סוד "council", the point is that a comparison may not be pressed to yield a consistent picture beyond the passage where it is expressed. This is particularly true of any attempt to visualize the comparison, for centuries of obedience to the commandment against images seem to have caused the visual imagination of Israel to atrophy, as can be shown in many Biblical passages. Recognition of this fact will be important when we turn to the New Testament images.

If the community of Qumran can be seen under the aspect of the temple, it should not surprise us to hear occasionally of the builders of this temple. Again, we should beware of thinking in terms of a process, for it is the finished temple which is envisaged in the comparison. Nevertheless, the builder in the sense of the founder can be mentioned. The building of the temple is clearly implied when CD III, 19 says of the foundation of the Qumran community that God "build for them (Israel) a firmly established house (בית נאמן) in Israel, the like of which never stood from earliest times to now." If God is the builder here, in 4Qflor I, 6 God "said that one should build for him a sanctuary of men." That a contradiction was not felt is shown by line 10, where a variant version of 2Sm 7:11 (which has יעשה) is cited as "Yahweh. . . will build you a house." It is God who builds and protects the temple, who founds and leads the community, even if this should be done through an agent. This is important when we turn to the text which is perhaps most important in reference to the New Testament, 4QpPs 37 III, 15f. Unfortunately the text is damaged:

(...) פשרו על הכוהן מורה ה(צדק)

(...) הכינו לבנות לו עדת (...)

"its interpretation (Ps 37:23f) refers to the priest, the righteous teacher. . . established him to build for him the congregation of . . ." Here is a very important parallel to Mt 16:18.

We have already discussed the opposition to the Jerusalem temple at Qumran.¹ Once more it must be emphasized that the

¹ Cf. above, pp. 119-128.

conception of the community as the temple has nothing to do with that opposition. On the contrary, opposition to the existing temple goes hand in hand with a very high valuation of the temple cult. The concept of the community as the temple, on the other hand, because it provides an effective substitute for the Jerusalem temple, would tend to make one indifferent to it. If all that is connected with the Zion tradition is removed from the temple itself and applied to the community, then it is this community which is important and not the temple. It is because the two were thought to be combined, that the Qumran conception of the community as the temple was only a jealous reaction, an artificial substitute for the real thing, that it has been assumed that the community as heir of the Zion tradition was an innovation of the Qumran covenanters. It is however more likely that this is not the case, but that similar ideas can be found in the Old Testament and in other groups within Judaism which were not opposed to the Jerusalem temple.

In our discussion of the Zion tradition¹ we saw how the conception of the temple as God's dwelling place and the place of his protection was broadened to include the city of Jerusalem and finally the inhabitants of the city. It is then conceivable that we should find passages in the Old Testament in which temple language is explicitly applied to the community as a whole. 2 Sm 7 plays on the double meaning of the word **בית**, temple or dynasty, but the idea of a community which Yahweh will build for David lies near at hand. One could point to such passages as Ezek 11:16, where God promises that he himself will be a sanctuary for Israel² or Ps 114:2, "Judah became his sanctuary, Israel his dominion."³ Similar to the Ezekiel passage is Is 8:14, which says that Yahweh "will be a sanctuary and a stone of offence." In an important study of the doctrine of Yahweh's presence with Israel, R.E. Clements⁴ has shown that for

¹ Cf. above, pp. 105-112.

² W. Zimmerli, *Ezechiel*, Biblischer Kommentar, Altes Testament XIII, Neukirchen, 1958, p. 249f, says that **אהיה להם למקדש** is but a variant of **אהיה להם לאלהים**. In the light of this passage one wonders if Ezek 37:26-28 really refers to a temple building when God says, "I will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore. My dwelling place shall be with them and I will be their God and they will be my people. Then the nations will know that I Yahweh sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary is in the midst of them for evermore."

³ Cf. H. J. Kraus, *Psalmen*, Biblischer Kommentar, Altes Testament XV, Neukirchen 1960, p. 782.

⁴ *God and Temple*, Philadelphia, 1965, p. 120.

the priestly writings this presence "is no longer associated with a particular place at all, but instead it is related to a cultic community." We have already suggested that the sanctuary of Dn 8:14 and 9:24 should be interpreted figuratively in terms of the holy community.¹ A fragment from Qumran² interprets Is 54:11ff in such a way that the "foundations" and the "sapphires" are the priests, and the "stones" are the "elect", the members of the community. It should be seriously considered whether or not this interpretation is right. It is the Zion community which is addressed in Isaiah, and we should perhaps read "builders" for "sons" in Vs 13 ("All your builders shall be taught by the Lord", cf. 49:17). Vs 14, "in righteousness you shall be established", seems to be dependent on Is 28:16f,³ a text which speaks definitely in terms of the temple and probably should be interpreted of the "redeemed community."⁴ Another interesting topic would be to show how the Pharisees applied to themselves as laymen provisions originally applying to the priests and thus prepared the way for the period after the destruction when the Shekinah was present whenever two were studying the law and went with Israel into the *galuth*. All of these are questions which the Qumran usage should reopen for further discussion.⁵

We have definitely learned from these Qumran texts that Wenschkewitz was wrong when he said that the idea of the temple as community was not to be found in Palestinian Judaism. We now have to investigate whether he was not also wrong when he said that the New Testament usage is Hellenistic and is therefore to be found primarily in the epistles. We have also learned from the Qumran texts certain methodological criteria for determining when the image of the temple is present. To discuss only those passages where the word "temple" appears would be too narrow, while to discuss all passages

¹ Cf. above, p. 118f; Cf. also W. H. Brownlee, "The Servant of the Lord in the Qumran Scrolls, 1," *BASOR* 132 (Dec. 1953), 8-15; and A. Feuillet, "Le Fils de l'homme de Daniel et la tradition biblique," *RB* 60 (1953), 170-202, 321-346.

² 4QpIs^d, cited from Gärtner, *Temple*, pp. 42f, 78f.

³ So C. North, *The Second Isaiah*, Oxford, 1964, p. 253.

⁴ So S. H. Hooke, "The Corner-Stone of Scripture," *The Siege Perilous*, London, 1956, pp. 235-249.

⁵ Again, Wenschkewitz has made a good beginning which should be revised in the light of the new discoveries; cf. op. cit., p. 39, "So ergibt sich, dass zwar die Hoffnung auf den Wiederaufbau des Tempels die Juden an einer Spiritualisierung des Tempels hinderte, dass aber der wesentliche Gedanke der Gegenwart Gottes in Israel vom Tempel frei wird."

which speak of "building" would be too broad. It is important to note the concepts which are associated with the temple in Qumran: 1. The community can be called the temple insofar as God dwells there. 2. This has as an important corollary that therefore the community is holy and must be holy (and the non-holy must be excluded). 3. The community as inheritor of the Zion tradition is promised that it will be firmly established and secure against all enemies. 4. The community as the temple is the place whence proceeds God's truth and the place where atonement and judgment are carried out. We turn now to an examination of the temple passages in the New Testament epistles.

B. The Ambiguity of the Image of the Temple in the New Testament Epistles

B. Gärtner has made a good case for the similarity of the temple image in the New Testament and Qumran.¹ At the same time he also points out the differences between the two, differences based largely on the fact that the New Testament outlook is completely dominated by the person of Jesus Christ. But it may be that this difference is more significant than Gärtner realizes and that the New Testament evidence is not so unified as he assumes. We are interested in the saying Mk 14:58 that Jesus will build a temple. Mt 16:18 says that Jesus will build a community, the foundation of which is Peter. On the other hand, in 1 Cor 3: 10f Paul is the architect who builds and the foundation is explicitly said to be Jesus. Which image is primary? Can the image of the temple be traced back to Palestinian Christianity? Is the second half of the the saying Mk 14:58 a genuine saying of Jesus? We shall examine some of the temple texts in the New Testament epistles, seeking if possible to determine their origin and earliest form.²

¹ He says, *Temple*, p. 100, "The temple symbolism of Qumran and the New Testament was thus based on three factors: criticism of the Jerusalem temple and its sacrifices; a belief that the last days had begun; and belief on the part of both groups that God had come to dwell with them." As we have seen, however, criticism of the Jerusalem temple has no direct connection with the concept of the new temple, neither in Qumran nor in the New Testament.

² Besides the studies by Wenschkewitz and Gärtner already mentioned, cf. Ph. Vielhauer, *Oikodome. Das Bild vom Bau in der christlichen Literatur vom NT bis Clemens Alexandrinus* (Diss. Heidelberg), Karlsruhe, 1940; M. Fraeyman, "La Spiritualisation de l'idée du temple dans les épîtres pauliniennes," *Eph. Theol. Lov.* 33 (1947), 378-412; K. L. Schmidt, "Die

The new Testament text which most closely parallels the conceptions of Qumran is 2 Cor 6:14-7:1.

- 14 Do not be misyoked with unbelievers. For what fellowship exists
between righteousness and lawlessness? Or what communion of light
15 with darkness? What accord exists between Christ and Beliar, or
16 what portion has a believer with an unbeliever? What agreement
exists between the temple of God and idols? For we are the temple
of the living God; as God said, "I will dwell in them and move among
them, and I will be their God and they will be my people" (Lev
17 26:11f; Ezek 37:27). Therefore "come out from their midst and be
separate," says the Lord, "and do not touch the unclean, and I will
18 receive you, and I will be to you a father, and you will be for me sons
and daughters, says the Lord Almighty" (Is 52:11; Ezek 20:34;
1 2 Sm 7:14). Since we have such promises, beloved, let us purify our-
selves from all defilement of body and spirit, perfecting holiness
in the fear of God.

The correspondences to Qumran are striking. There is first the dualism: righteousness vs. lawlessness, light vs. darkness, Christ vs. Beliar, believer vs. unbeliever, temple of God vs. idols. The very name Beliar, found only here in the New Testament, is typical of Qumran,¹ and only the mention of Christ would show that this text is on the way to the Christian conception of the Anti-Christ. The chain of Old Testament texts, which are not quoted exactly but according to the meaning desired in their present context, is a common Qumran phenomenon. Finally, the whole thrust of this passage, "to separate oneself from the sons of perdition . . . and from property which is . . . unclean" (CD VI, 14f), is much more typical of Qumran than most of the New Testament. All of these considerations led Fitzmyer² to suppose that the whole passage has been interpolated into 2 Corinthians from an Essene source. If this solution seems too extreme, it is perhaps enough to suggest more plausibly with Kuhn³ that Paul himself has freely cited the

Erbauung der Kirche mit ihren Gliedern als den 'Fremdlingen und Beisassen auf Erden' (Heb 11-13)," *Wesen und Aufgabe der Kirche in der Welt*, Zürich, 1947, pp. 5-30; P. Bonnard, *Jésus-Christ édifiant son Eglise*, Neuchâtel, 1948; Y. Congar, *Le mystère du temple*, Paris, 1958; and J. Pfammatter, *Die Kirche als Bau*, Rome, 1960.

¹ It is found some 35 times in the texts published to date, and is also in such writings related to Qumran as Test. XII Pat. and Jub.; cf. H. W. Huppenbauer, "Belial in den Texten von Qumran," *ThZ* 15 (1959), 81-89.

² "Qumran and the Interpolated Paragraph in 2 Cor 6, 14-7, 1," *CBQ* 23 (1961), 271-280.

³ "Les rouleaux de cuivre de Qumrân," *RB* 61 (1954), 193-205, p. 203.

passage from an Essene source. If so, the contact is likely to have been not direct but through the Jerusalem congregation. There may have been a reason for Paul to urge the Corinthians to be separate and not to touch the unclean, but because the passage is so isolated, there is no way of determining what this might have been. Whatever its origin, it is significant simply that such a passage which so clearly reflects Qumran usage should be present in a Pauline epistle.

The context in which the comparison of the congregation to the temple is made is very significant. Paul is urging his readers to be holy ("let us purify ourselves from all defilement... perfecting holiness") because they already are holy, and they are holy because "we are the temple of the living God." The point of comparison is holiness, and both the temple and the community are holy because God dwells within them. This is the same point of comparison that we found at Qumran.¹ Because God dwells in the community, therefore that community must be holy, just as Israel in the wilderness had to be holy because of God's dwelling in the camp. In this conception of God's dwelling with his people are united the fulfilment of the exodus and the Zion tradition. In fact, the text quoted in order to demonstrate that the Christians are the place of God's dwelling has some points in common with a text from the Zion tradition, Ezek 37:27, and some in common with a text from the exodus tradition, Lev 26:11f. But whereas both of these texts speak of the dwelling place of God (משכן), 2 Corinthians uses a verbal form, ἐνοικέω (= שכן), a point that it has in common with the same *testimonium* as cited in Rev 21:3 (σκηνώ). This is not the only point of contact with Rev 21. Our text quotes the Nathan prophecy, 2 Sm 7:14 ("I will be his father and he shall be my son"), in a most unusual collective form: "I will be to you a father and you will be for me sons and daughters." Rev 21:7 has the same interpretation: "he who conquers shall inherit these things, and I will be his God and he shall be my son."² When we have two texts which both join this unusual exposition of 2 Sm 7:14 to the understanding of the congregation as the temple, with again verbal agreement over against the Old Testament texts cited,³ then there

¹ Cf. Nötscher, art. cit.

² Cf. also Rev 2:26f applying Ps 2:7 collectively.

³ D. Plooi, *Studies in the Testimony Book*, Amsterdam, 1932, p. 20, points out that the reading in 1 Cor 6 has points of contact with the Targums, which he takes to be a sign of an Aramaic origin of the testimonies here.

is clearly a connection between them. When we recall in addition that these two elements, the community as the temple and the collective understanding of 2 Sm 7:14, are to be found together in 4Qflor, then the source of the connection becomes apparent.

Our very great interest in 2 Cor 6:14ff lies in a number of negative observations. First, there is no mention of the Jerusalem temple whatsoever. This text did not originate from the frame of mind we discussed in Chapter III, 2, but is derived rather from a positive interpretation of the temple as the community. Second, and this is important, there is no Christological reference in the passage. Indeed, the name Christ appears but once, and were it not for its inclusion in a Pauline letter and this one proper name, there would be nothing specifically Christian about the passage. Finally, the passage is significant for us precisely because of its un-Pauline vocabulary and character (be separate from the unclean!) and because of its close affinities with Qumran on the one hand and the Jewish-Christian book of Revelation of the other.

When we turn to another Pauline temple passage 1 Cor 6:19, we are confronted with quite a different situation. While there are certainly some points of similarity with 2 Cor 6:14ff, the main thrust of the passage seems quite another. If in Qumran the image of the temple applies exclusively to the community, here it is a matter of the individual body. Paul argues that consorting with prostitutes is not as harmless because merely physical as some of the Corinthians seem to think, for our individual physical bodies are members of the body of Christ (6:15). Sexual union means being really united with the partner into one body, whereas we should rather be united with the Lord in one "spirit" (Vs 16f). Then the argument concludes as follows:

18f The fornicator sins against his own body. Or do you not know
 that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit which is within you
 (pl.), which Spirit you have from God, and that you are not your
 20 own? For you were purchased with a price. Glorify God then with
 your body.

The words "do you not know", which appear some ten times in 1 Corinthians,¹ seem always to refer to some earlier instruction, either oral or in a previous letter. This does not however mean that

¹ Cf. 1 Cor 5:6; 6:2, 3, 9, 15, 16; 9:13, 24, and especially 3:16, another temple passage.

they indicate a mere repetition of what has been said before, for it seems that Paul makes use of concepts previously known in order to teach the Corinthians something quite new. Thus even if the Corinthians had been aware of Jesus' teaching on marriage according to the Genesis passage "the two shall become one flesh" (Mk 10: 7f, quoting Gen 2:24), the application to sexual union with a prostitute is a quite new and even startling one. Similarly, the argument from the concept of the temple, which seems to have been added almost as an afterthought, uses a known conception in what is undoubtedly a new application. It is the context which makes necessary the equation of the individual body with the temple, and we should not generalize the equation apart from the context. The concept of the temple found here seems to be an *ad hoc* Pauline creation.

Previous discussions of 1 Cor 6:19 have tended to focus on the alternative: Stoic-Philonic¹ or Jewish eschatological.² It is however more likely that the text is neither but is rather distinctively Pauline. Although both the Stoics and Philo can speak of God dwelling in the soul,³ they never say as does Paul that he dwells in the body, and they speak always of the individual and not the community as the temple of the deity.⁴ On the other hand, while in Qumran the concept of the community as the temple would have important consequences for the individual, they would never say that the body of the individual is a temple of God. Paul may very well use earlier conceptions, but the formulation is strictly his own. We can perhaps best understand Paul's thought here if we begin from the conception of the community as the temple.⁵ An indication that this is the basic conception is perhaps given by the fact that Paul does not simply say that the individual body is a temple of the Holy Spirit, but it is rather "a temple of the Holy Spirit which is within your community (ἐν ὑμῖν)." We also note that the word

¹ E.g. Wenschkewitz, *Spiritualisierung*, pp. 113f., but also Fitzmyer, art. cit., p. 277.

² E.g. J. Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, Göttingen, 1925², p. 84.

³ Cf. the passages cited by Wenschkewitz, pp. 49ff, and by Michel, *TWNT*, IV, 891.

⁴ "Weder in der Stoa noch bei Philo treffen wir diesen Gedanken, denn hier war alles auf den Einzelnen, auf das Individuum eingestellt," Wenschkewitz, *Spiritualisierung*, p. 112.

⁵ "Le thème de l'individu-temple est donc secondaire chez Paul," Fraeyman, "Spiritualisation," p. 400.

"temple" is singular, thus differing from the more Hellenistic formulation of Ignatius, Eph 15:3, "let us then do all things as those who have him dwelling in us, so that we may be his temples (pl.) and he may be our God in us."¹ Although I Cor 6:19 tends in this direction, it is still close to the concept of the community as the temple. As we have seen in connection with Qumran and 2 Cor 6, the concept of the temple as the community has as a consequence the holiness of the community and all its members, and this seems to be the point which has led Paul to make the application here. The very imprecision of the image is a sign that Paul is not introducing anything new, from the Stoics or elsewhere, but is rather modifying what must have been for the Corinthians a well known concept.

The third passage in which Paul makes explicit reference to the congregation as the *ναός* of God is 1 Cor 3:16f. Again, as in the passage just discussed, the statement comes as the conclusion of a longer argument. As there is a question about the interpretation of the earlier building, the whole passage will be quoted:

- 5 Who then is Apollos? Who is Paul? Servants through whom you
- 6 came to believe, and to each as the Lord gave it. I planted, Apollos
- 7 watered, but God made it grow. So that neither the planter is anything
- 8 nor the waterer, but he who makes it grow, God. The planter and the
- waterer are one, and each shall receive his own reward according to his
- 9 own efforts. For we are fellow workers of God; you are God's field,
- God's building.
- 10 According to the grace of God which was given to me, I laid the
- foundation like a wise master-builder, and another builds on it. Let
- 11 each one be careful how he builds. For no one can lay a different
- 12 foundation besides that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ. If
- someone builds on the foundation with gold, silver, precious stones,
- 13 wood, grass, or straw, the work of each will become apparent. For
- the day will show it, because it will be revealed by fire, and the fire
- 14 itself will test how the work of each was done. If the work which
- 15 anyone has built on remains, he will receive a reward. If the work of
- anyone is burned up, it will be lost, though he himself will be saved,
- but as through fire.
- 16 Do you not know that you are the temple of God and that the
- 17 Spirit of God dwells in you? If anyone destroys the temple of God,
- God will destroy him. For holy is the temple of God, which you are.

¹ Cf. Phil. 7:2; Barnabas 4:11; 6:15; 2 Clem. 9:3. The natural Hellenistic understanding is shown by *Ν** and Clement Alex., who have "corrected" 2 Cor 6:16 to read "for we are temples (*ναοί*) of the living God."

We have quoted this passage extensively, in order to show how Paul leads up to the specific statement about the temple in Vs 16f.¹ He was faced with the problem of divisions in the church at Corinth, and there seems to have been a Cephas party and an Apollos party and a Pauline party. Over against this division Paul must emphasize the unity of the church, which is not a community founded by men but by God. He begins by speaking of the church in terms of a field, which he has planted but which Apollos has watered. But the important thing is that it is God who makes the church grow, and so Paul concludes: "You are God's field, God's building." Here a quite new image is introduced, that of a building, but the combination is not too unusual (cf. Jer 1:10; 18:9; Col 2:7; Eph 3:17). The images are combined only in the sense of being set side by side, and there is no contamination of one image by the other, even if the image of the field might naturally suggest that Paul go on to speak of a building.

After the transition to the image of a building, Paul continues to speak in these terms. If before Paul was the planter, here he is the wise master-builder who has laid the foundation. It is not said that the building is the temple, and we have as yet no reason whatsoever for assuming that it is. Paul has laid the foundation, i.e. placed the large stones which will carry the whole building, and other workers build on top of his beginnings. The whole point of the image is to exhort the Corinthians that each man is responsible for the work he does on the building. This is carried out in some detail in Vs 12-15. Everyone builds as he can, but on the day of judgment the building will undergo a trial of fire, and only the fire-resistant materials will remain. If anyone has built with combustible material, wood, grass, or straw, that person will suffer the loss of his work, which will be all burned up. It is not clear how such different materials can be used in one building, and Pfammatter thinks that each person builds his own house.² This would however completely destroy Paul's point that there can be only one founder of a congregation and only one foundation of a building.

¹ Cf. the excellent discussion of this passage in Pfammatter, *Bau*, pp. 19-44. If Pfammatter is misled in trying to combine the building of Vs 9ff with the temple of Vs 16f, it is because the idea of church leaders as *συνεργοὶ θεοῦ* is so appealing to him.

² *Bau*, pp. 27ff. He translates *ἔργον* as "building", a translation he seeks to justify by reference to Bertram, *TWNT*, II, 632. But while the translation is possible in some contexts, it is doubtful here.

Vs 11, "no one can lay a different foundation besides that which is laid (by Paul), which is Jesus Christ," is a bit different from each one being careful how he builds. Here no one should separate from the one congregation founded by Paul and try to establish another one on another foundation. Almost incidentally Paul says that the foundation he has laid is Jesus Christ. Barrett¹ sees in this statement, and the statement that the church is God's building, a polemic against the claim of Peter and the Twelve to be the foundation (cf. Gal 2:9). This is possible, but it is more likely that Paul is not thinking in these terms at all. The foundation he has laid is the foundation Jesus Christ, just as the gospel he preaches is the gospel of Jesus Christ (Gal 1:6ff). Just as no one can preach a different gospel, so no one can lay a different foundation.² We are now faced with the question whether or not we are to interpret the foundation in terms of temple imagery.

The difference between a temple and any other building is that the former is the dwelling place of God and therefore holy. As the image of building as such is more widespread than the specific temple image, we should never assume that the temple is meant unless there are specific indications to this effect.³ There are no such indications in Vs 5-15. Paul makes first the point that the congregation belongs not to Paul or Apollos but to God; it is *his* field and building. Here God is the proprietor and not he who dwells within. There is a slight transition of the image when the Corinthians are urged to build wisely on the one foundation which Paul has laid. The motive for doing so is not that the congregation as the temple of God is holy, but rather that the work of each will be judged by fire and accordingly everyone should build well. If the temple is not really involved here, then there is no reason to

¹ "Paul and the 'Pillar' Apostles," *Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan*, Haarlem, 1953, pp. 1-19.

² It is in this sense that Jesus Christ is the foundation, not that of the person of Christ. Pfammatter, *Bau*, p. 26f, thinks of "word and sacrament".

³ O. Michel says, *TWNT* V, 129, that "die Vorstellung, dass die Gemeinde 'Haus Gottes' sei, hängt offenbar mit der alten Verkündigung, dass die Gemeinde 'Tempel' Gottes sei, zusammen und ist aus ihr erwachsen," and concerning the source of the concept he supposes, *TWNT* IV, 890, "dass der Apostel (Paulus) die Weissagung Jesu in einer Mk 14, 58 verwandten Form katechetisch auswertet." While in a general sense this is important and true, it cannot be applied every time the words οἶκος or οἰκοδομή appear. In this case it is especially hard to understand how a statement in which Paul builds a house could be derived from Mk 14:58 in which Jesus is the builder.

think of it when Paul says he laid the foundation. This has no more to do with the temple than does Rm 15:20, where Paul claims that he has sought "to proclaim the gospel where Christ has not yet been named, and I should not build on the foundation of another." It seems that "to lay the foundation" is a general metaphor for "founding" a community, and we find the phrase used elsewhere as such.¹ 1 Cor 3:10 may therefore not be used in a discussion of the temple image in the New Testament.

In spite of appearances, Vs 16f are not a continuation of the image of the building developed in the preceding verses, but are an additional statement: "and besides you are holy, for you know that the congregation is called the temple of God." Here we have not only the word *ναός* but all of the conceptions which go with it: the dwelling place of God and the consequent holiness, and also the divine protection of Zion against Beliar and all enemies. That Paul is referring to something the Corinthians have already heard is shown by the introduction, "do you not know. . ." It can be readily granted that this reference to the temple of God has been suggested by the previous image of the building, but it is not really appropriate to speak of the temple here. In the first place there is a clear contradiction involved in the fate of the erring church member. In the image of the building that person who does not build well will see his work destroyed, but "he himself will be saved (*σωθήσεται*)."² In the image of the temple, "God will destroy (*φθερεῖ*)" that person. Paul is still thinking of the schismatics and warning them of the consequences of their activity against the unity of the church. They are not "spiritual men" (Vs 1) but "fleshly men" insofar as there is jealousy and strife among them (Vs 3); in this sense they are offending against the Holy Spirit and against the unity of the congregation in which the Holy Spirit dwells. This would suggest that in working against unity they are seeking to destroy the temple of God, and the eschatological *lex talionis*³ applies: "if anyone destroys the temple of God, God will destroy him."³ However, such a law cannot apply in this case, because of the conception of the divine protection of the temple. The temple cannot be destroyed by Belial

¹ "Das Bild vom Fundamentlegen scheint in der Diatribe häufig zu sein," J. Weiss, *1 Kor.*, p. 79.

² So E. Käsemann, "Sätze heiligen Rechtes im Neuen Testament," *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*, II, Göttingen, 1964, pp. 69-82, p. 69.

³ Cf. the close parallel Rev 11:18, where God "destroys (*διαφθεῖραι*) the destroyers of the earth."

and all his forces, and certainly not by the Corinthians. Thus only superficially does the temple concept apply to the situation Paul is discussing. In seeking to apply the image of the temple to a discussion originally framed in quite different terms, he has been led to a statement which would modify the image rather radically. We can learn then from 1 Cor 3:16f only that the concept of the congregation as the temple was current in the Pauline churches, without being able to infer anything further from Paul's own use of the concept.

There is another passage in the Pauline epistles where to be sure the word *ναός* does not appear, but where so many other temple expressions occur that we can again assume this concept as a background. In this case it is even clearer that Paul is filling an old image with new content, so much so that the passage is usually not discussed in this connection at all. We refer to 2 Cor 5:1.

For we know that if our earthly house, i.e. tent (*οικία τοῦ σκηνους*) is destroyed (*καταλυθῇ*), we have a building (*οικοδομήν*) from God, a house not made with hands (*ἀχειροποίητον*), eternal in the heavens.

This passage is usually explained in accordance with the Gnostic conception of the individual body as a house or tent in which the soul dwells.¹ Paul would then be speaking of a promise for the individual soul that when its earthly body dies it will inhabit an individual spiritual body in heaven. Such a conception is so un-Pauline as to be extremely unlikely. In context Paul speaks of the general resurrection (4:14) and the last judgment (5:10), and the present passage is perfectly in accord with what is said about the resurrection in 1 Cor 15.² J.A.T. Robinson³ points out that even though the putting on of the heavenly dwelling will not occur until the parousia, the building is definitely singular and a present possession (*ἔχομεν*), even before death. He therefore assimilates the "building" of this passage to the concept of the body of Christ, the church.⁴ K. Barth⁵ goes even further with an ecclesiological interpretation, whereby even the earthly house represents the church in its present form.

¹ So Vielhauer, *Oikodome*, pp. 107ff.

² Strongly emphasized by J. Hering, *La Seconde Épître de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens*, Neuchâtel, 1958, p. 48.

³ *The Body; A Study in Pauline Theology*, London, 1952, pp. 76f.

⁴ Also E. E. Ellis, "II Corinthians v. 1-10 in Pauline Eschatology," *NTS* 6 (1960), 211-224, maintains that the house not made with hands is the corporate Messianic community, the new temple.

⁵ *Kirchliche Dogmatik* IV, 2, Zürich, 1955, pp. 710f.

The statement has for him primarily "ecclesiological-eschatological" character, in which secondarily an "individual-anthropological" conception has been included. It remains to show how this complex situation could have come about. In speaking of the building, Paul applies to the Christian resurrection hope a related but quite distinct usage. E.G. Selwyn¹ has pointed out the similarity of the vocabulary of 2 Cor 5:1 with the saying Mk 14:58: "I will destroy (καταλύσω) this temple which is made with hands and in three days build (οικοδομήσω) another which is not made with hands (ἀχειροποίητον)." If the second half of this saying was known to Paul in a form in which the promise of the new temple not made with hands was seen to be ultimately fulfilled in the resurrection life of the age to come but also fulfilled in a preliminary manner in the life of the church, then we could see how it would be related to his present concern. The Holy Spirit, which we have already now as the present earnest of the future promise (5:5), might also have suggested this temple imagery. Whether Paul knew the saying in the form which mentioned the destruction of the temple is less sure but possible. The heavenly temple, the new Jerusalem, is one concept in New Testament eschatology, and the resurrection of the body, in which we put on or are given a "spiritual body", is another concept. Paul has here confused the two. If the "building from God, a house not made with hands" is definitely in terms of the former, nevertheless the "earthly house" can hardly be interpreted in any other way than as the individual "physical body" (1 Cor 15:44). Even if, as Barth maintains, the ecclesiological-eschatological character is embedded in what it has in common with Mk 14:58, nevertheless Paul's main concern seems to be with the individual's resurrection. While the new temple and the spiritual body may be related over the bridge of the "body of Christ", nevertheless they remain two separate conceptions which have here been combined. 1 Cor 5:1 is then one further example of the fact that while Paul definitely knew and made use of the concept of the new temple, it is usually presented in such a modified form that we cannot derive the early Christian understanding of the image from Paul's use of it.

A very indirect but nevertheless important witness to the concept of the community as the temple is provided by the collection Paul made for the church in Jerusalem. It has been suggested² that this

¹ *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, London, 1958, pp. 289f.

² W. L. Knox, *Saint Paul and the Church of Jerusalem*, Cambridge, 1925,

collection was a very conscious parallel to the temple tax. As the collection was for the Jerusalem congregation, this would be another indication that the concept had its true home there and that it was not an essential part of Pauline theology. Indeed W.L. Knox finds it significant that it should be mentioned by Paul only in those letters written from Ephesus (1, 2 Cor, cf. Eph) when Paul was working on the collection.¹

It is doubtful whether 2 Thes 2 should be considered in this connection at all, whatever interpretation one gives to the *ἄνθρωπος τοῦ θεοῦ*. The "man of lawlessness, the son of perdition" is Belial, the Anti-Christ.² If in the original form of the myth this power sits in the seat of the gods (Ezek 28:2; Is 14:13f), the actions of Antiochos Epiphanes caused the Jewish tradition to speak rather of the Jerusalem temple. Thus when 2 Thes 2:4 says of the Anti-Christ that "he takes his seat in the temple of God, proclaiming himself to be God", the original reference is to the actual Jerusalem temple. This conception must be considered completely apart from the Zion tradition, according to which God would protect this temple, city, community from the last great attack of Belial. Although it is probable that nothing more than the actual Jerusalem temple is meant here,³ even if the author of 2 Thes should interpret the "temple of God" as the Christian community,⁴ this would be a distinctively secondary application which would add nothing to our discussion of the community as the temple.

We have seen that while Paul knows and can make use of the conception of the new temple it is not an important part of his own theology. It may form part of the background of such an important conception as the body of Christ,⁵ but the connection is not explicit. The concept of the heavenly Jerusalem (Gal 4:26) is of course intimately related to the Zion tradition, but this is not the same thing as applying temple imagery to the present congregation. The concept of the community as the temple is present only when we

pp. 284ff; E.B. Allo, "La portée de la collecte pour Jérusalem dans les plans de Saint Paul," *RB* 45 (1936), 529-537; J. Munck, *Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte*, Copenhagen, 1954, pp. 277-301.

¹ *Paul and Jerusalem*, p. 290, n. 4. He points out that it was precisely Asian Jews who accused Paul of speaking against the temple, Acts 21:28.

² W. Bousset, *Der Antichrist in der Überlieferung des Judentums, des Neuen Testaments und der alten Kirche*, Göttingen, 1895, pp. 99ff.

³ So B. Rigaux, *Les Épitres aux Thessaloniens*, Paris, 1956, p. 660.

⁴ So Pfammatter, *Bau*, pp. 7-9.

⁵ Cf. E. Best, *One Body in Christ*, London, 1955, pp. 160-168.

see that the point of comparison is the dwelling place of God or the Holy Spirit, with the consequent holiness. It would therefore be a mistake to assume that all passages where Paul speaks of building the congregation must necessarily be derived from the temple image. The use of the word οἰκοδομέω (בנה) to refer to the fostering of the well-being of a community perhaps was no longer even a conscious metaphor in the first century but only a manner of speaking as in our use of the concept of "edification".¹ Thus when Paul speaks of himself (Gal 2:18; 2 Cor 10:8; 12:19; 13:10; Rm 15:20) or of others (1 Thes 5:11; 1 Cor 8:1, 10; 10:23; 14:2, 3, 5, 12, 17, 26; cf. Acts 9:31; 20:32; Eph 4:12, 16, 29) building up the church, this is a simple metaphor as in the Old Testament (Jer 1:10; 12:16; 24:6; 31:4; 33:7; 42:10; Ps 28:5; 102:17; cf. Sir 49:7; etc.) and does not presuppose the image of the temple. That the church can be said to be "firmly grounded" (Col 1:23; 2:7; Eph 3:17) also does not necessarily presuppose the image of the foundation of the temple. Even the conjunction of building and destroying (Gal 2:18; 2 Cor 10:8; 13:10) comes more from Jer 1:10 than Mk 14:58. Jer 1:10 also speaks of planting as well as building, and while we may have cases of a mixed metaphor in the New Testament (1 Cor 3:9; Col 2:7; Eph 3:17), this does not mean a combination of the concepts of Paradise and the new temple. Only Eph 4:15f is more than a simple metaphor: "Speaking the truth in love, let us grow in every respect unto him who is the head, Christ, from whom the whole body, joined and united by each joint with which it is supplied, according to the working on the part of each one proportionally, produces the growth of the body for the edification of itself in love." The image is one of growth, and while the metaphor of edification is used, there is here no admixture of the image of the temple.² As we are interested not in metaphors but in the conscious image of the temple in the New Testament epistles, none of these passages are relevant to our purposes.

1 Peter 2:4-9 is an appropriate text with which to demonstrate the complexity of the New Testament concept of the spiritual temple. On the one hand, the similarity of this text to Qumran is

¹ Cf. Vielhauer, *Oikodome*, who points out the Old Testament antecedents and states pointedly p. 86, "Paulus macht . . . ναός oder οἶκος θεοῦ nie zum Objekt von οἰκοδομεῖν."

² This must be emphasized over against Michel, *TWNT* V, 148, and Gärtner, *Temple*, pp. 65f. Cf. C. Masson, *L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Éphésiens*, Neuchâtel, 1953, pp. 195-199.

obvious, as can be demonstrated in some detail. On the other hand, there are important differences, concerned largely with the person of Christ. The key factor in tracing the history of the traditions found here lies in the concept of the "stone", concerning which 1 Peter quotes no less than three testimonies. The relevant text, found characteristically in one of 1 Peter's dogmatic supports for his ethical exhortations, reads as follows:

4 Having come to him, to the living stone, rejected by men but for
5 God chosen and precious, you yourselves be built as living stones
as a spiritual temple, to be a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacri-
6 fices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. For it stands in script-
ure, "Behold, I lay in Zion a cornerstone, chosen and precious, and
7 he who believes in him will not be put to shame" (Is 28:16). For you
who believe then there is honor, but for the unbelievers "the stone
which the builders rejected has become the capstone" (Ps 118:22)
8 and "a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense" (Is 8:14); they
stumble who disobey the word, for which purpose it was placed
9 there. But you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation,
a people for God's own possession.

D. Flusser¹ finds so many points of contact between this passage and 1 QS VIII, 4-10 that he even assumes "some literary dependence"² of 1 Peter on the earlier text. Thus he brings together "spiritual house" and "sanctuary for Israel. . . house of perfection and truth in Israel"; "spiritual sacrifices" and "to offer a pleasing odor"; "acceptable to God" and "acceptable"; the "cornerstone in Zion" and "the tested wall, the precious cornerstone"; "he who believes shall not be put to shame" and "whose foundations shall not tremble nor yield from their place". Apart from the common use of Is 28:16, all of these parallels are confined to one verse, 1 Pet 2:5. Here indeed, but only here, we have not literary dependence but the common concept of the community as the temple.

The differences between 1 Peter and the Qumran texts are even more significant. First there is the fact that Is 28:16 does not stand alone but is associated with two other stone passages, Ps 118:22 and Is 8:14. When we consider that these same stone texts are found together Rm 9:33 and that these texts have provided the

¹ "The Dead Sea Sect and pre-Pauline Christianity," *Scripta Hierosolymitana* IV, Jerusalem, 1958, pp. 215-266. Cf. also his "Two Notes on the Midrash on 2 Sam. vii," *Isr. Explor. Journ.* 9 (1959), 99-109.

² "Dead Sea Sect," p. 235; the parallels are listed in Greek and Hebrew columns p. 233.

impetus for the hypothesis of an early Christian testimony book, it is apparent that we shall have to consider them in a separate discussion. The second main difference is that Is 28:16 has been modified to express the necessity of faith in Jesus, again a Christological modification of what originally referred to the community. Finally, there is the strange doubling of the living stones. There is no parallel in Qumran for one person, Jesus, being called a living stone, but there is for the members of the community being built as stones into a wall. With clear reference to Is 28, they are called "tested stones" rather than a "tested stone".¹ It seems apparent that one of these applications of the stone image, either to Jesus or to the community, is secondary in 1 Peter. It remains to determine which one.

The concept of spiritual sacrifices² is an important one, but it is not directly connected with our problem. As already the Old Testament shows, one can make use of the concept alongside the offering of real sacrifices or apart from an understanding of the community as the temple. We cannot then adduce such passages as Rm 12:1; Phil 4:18; Eph 5:1f; Heb 13:15 as evidence for an early Christian concept of the community as the temple. Nevertheless, this latter concept would certainly favor the use of the idea of spiritual sacrifices, even if only as a secondary application. That spiritual sacrifices were not associated with the community-temple from the beginning in the early church is perhaps indicated by the evidence of the gospels. Although there are gospel sayings concerning the temple there are none concerning spiritual sacrifices, and in view of the disinterest of Jesus in cultic matters, perhaps none should be expected. We shall confine ourselves therefore to the primary image of the temple.

One of the most important texts illustrating the New Testament conception of the community as the temple is Eph 2:19-22.³ The letter is speaking to Gentile Christians, who were formerly "alienated from the commonwealth (πολιτεία) of Israel and strangers to the covenants of promise" (Vs 12). But Jesus, who is "our peace", came and "has broken down the dividing wall of hostility" which

¹ 1QH VI, 26. Gärtner, *Temple*, p. 78, also refers to the very fragmentary 4QpIs^d, a midrash on Is 54:11f which interprets the sapphires as priests and the stones as "the people, the community of his elect."

² Cf. Wenschkewitz, *Spiritualisierung*, passim; Selwyn, 1 *Peter*, pp. 294-298; Gärtner, *Temple*, pp. 44-46.

³ Cf. the extended discussion by Pfammatter, *Bau*, pp. 73-107.

existed between Israel and the nations (Vs 14). "He came and preached peace to you who were far off and peace to those who were near" (Vs 17), so that both Israel and Gentiles might through him "have access to the Father" (Vs 18).

Although the language is Hellenistic, the conception of the relationship of Gentiles and Israel comes closer to that of the Palestinian church than do the recognized Pauline epistles.¹ Salvation is offered to the Gentiles when they come to Mount Zion and join themselves to the "commonwealth" of Israel (a Hellenized version of the Zion tradition). Jesus came to preach peace, a typically Proto-Lucan conception, to the Gentiles who were far off and to Israel who was near (cf. Acts 2:39). Here as elsewhere the theme of the eschatological coming of the Gentiles is connected with the theme of the temple. Thus the statement that the Gentiles would have access to the Father uses definite cultic language,² and the dividing wall refers concretely to the *soreg* (B.J. V, 193f) of the temple, a wall containing a warning tablet saying that Gentiles could not enter. This temple text then differs from that of 1 Cor 3:16f in that the temple imagery was in the forefront of the author's mind throughout the paragraph which leads up to the explicit statement:

19 Therefore you are now no longer strangers and sojourners, but
 you are fellow citizens with the saints and members of the household
 20 of God, being built on top of the foundation of the apostles and
 21 prophets, the cornerstone of which is Jesus Christ, through whom
 the whole building, joined together, grows into a temple holy in
 22 the Lord, through whom you too are built together to a dwelling
 place of God in the Spirit.

The Gentiles are said to be no longer **בני נכר וגרים**, the group which in 4Qflor I, 4 are forbidden to enter the community (temple). That these Gentiles may now enter the temple and have access to the Father is because they have been enabled to do so by the Holy Spirit, i.e. by their baptism.³ Through the Holy Spirit the Gentiles have been made holy and are thus fellow citizens with the saints. If the word *συμπολῖται* (fellow citizens), referring back to the "commonwealth" of Vs 12, is Hellenistic in form, the meaning is cultic and Jewish. Israel is holy and therefore Israelites are "saints", because of the presence of God in their midst.

¹ Cf. below, pp. 298-334.

² Cf. K. L. Schmidt, *TWNT* I, 131-134.

³ Cf. H. Sahlin, *Die Beschneidung Christi*, Uppsala, 1950.

This sanctity because of the presence of God refers specifically to the temple, for the Gentiles have become "members of the household of God." Again while the Greek *οἰκεῖται* can only refer to members of a household, the Hebrew expression *בני בית* would be ambiguous. The sense is that the Gentiles have become part of the temple community, or even, in terms of the following image, that they have become part of the temple itself: "you have become part of the house of God, being built on the foundation. . ." Although now the Gentiles are said to be part of the temple building, this image is not the introduction of a completely new concept, because the entire paragraph from Vs 11 on has been couched in cultic terms. It is the context which gives to such words as *συμπολῖται* and *οἰκεῖται* a meaning which otherwise would never be ascribed to them. The text up to this point has spoken in terms of the temple community, but now it goes on to speak of the community itself as the temple.

Jews and Gentiles are "built on" an already existing foundation. Although they are not explicitly called living stones as in 1 Pet 2:5, this is definitely the sense of the image. Each individual Christian becomes as it were one stone in a building which is still in process of construction.¹ The finished product is called a "temple holy in the Lord", and it is called this because it is the "dwelling place of God in the Spirit." It is perfectly clear that we have the image in the same sense as at Qumran. The community is the temple in that it is the dwelling place of God, and therefore the members of the community are called holy.

The foundation is already there, on which the living stones are to be built. This foundation could be either the solid rock under the building or a series of large stones on which the walls of the building are to be set. This foundation is said to be made up of² "apostles and prophets." The most likely explanation of this phrase is that it is a "hendiadys."³ It is further probable that it is the Twelve

¹ That the building is said to grow is not due to the admixture of the plantation image, for *αὐξάνω* is a perfectly proper word to use of a building being constructed. This must be very strongly emphasized against Gärtner, *Temple*, pp. 65f, and especially J. Jeremias, who is able to maintain in numerous works (cf. below, p. 215, note 1) that Eph 2:20 refers to the capstone and the parousia of Christ only by combining the building image of Eph 2 with the growth image of Eph 4:15f. This is illegitimate.

² Genitivus epexegeticus; cf. Pfammatter, pp. 80-84.

³ Sahlin, *Beschneidung*, p. 18; Pfammatter, pp. 84-87.

who are here characterized as the prophet-apostles and that our text is related to the image of Rev 21:14, "twelve foundations and on them the twelve names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb." The Lamb is of course not part of the foundation, but also in the Ephesians text the foundation seems to be made up exclusively of the twelve prophet-apostles. This leads us to the major problem of the text.

The function of Christ in the building is not at all clear. The genitive absolute which inserts him into text, *ὄντος ἀκρογωνιαίου αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, is ambiguous, and the meaning of the word *ἀκρογωνιαίος* is unclear. If the image is based on Is 28, then Jesus is said to be the cornerstone, and the word *αὐτοῦ* would refer to the antecedent "foundation". Since the Isaiah text is explicitly cited in 1 Pet 2:6, and since this is the most natural way to read the sentence, we have assumed this construction in our translation. The sense however is then very peculiar. Even if the cornerstone should be the most important stone in a foundation, it does not seem consonant with the position of Christ in Ephesians to make him only one stone in the foundation alongside twelve other stones which are the prophet-apostles. There is then another possibility, for Jeremias¹ has shown that *ἀκρογωνιαίος* can also mean "capstone". We would then have to translate: "Jesus Christ himself being the capstone." While this is a possibility, the only consideration in its favor is Jesus' peculiar position in the foundation, and it is only a minor improvement to make him the capstone, for his role then would only be to complete the building at the parousia. Whether Jesus is the most important stone in the foundation or in the building itself, still he is only one stone among others. It seems that Jesus has been added to an image in which originally he had no place as is shown not only by his introduction in a subordinate genitive absolute,² but even more by the fact that his place in the image is not really appropriate.

That Jesus' introduction into the building is clearly secondary is

¹ Cf. below, pp. 215-223, for references and a discussion of the translation.

² If it were a matter of a simple insertion of a phrase into an already existing sentence, one would be tempted to remove the whole of Vs 20b-21, so that the sentence would read: "you are being built on top of the foundation of the apostles and prophets, on which you too are built together to a dwelling place of God in the Spirit." However, it is not a matter of the introduction of a new phrase into an already existing sentence, but of a new concept into an already existing image.

shown by Vs 21, where he has quite a different role. Here Jesus appears much more appropriately not as part of the temple but as the builder of the whole. The ἐν ᾧ which begins the verse refers back to Jesus and is instrumental. This makes it likely that the ἐν ᾧ of Vs 22 refers to him also, so that the κύριος will be the Lord Jesus. The image here is unambiguous: the individual Christians are like building stones which are being put together to construct "a holy temple in the Lord," and it is the Lord Jesus who "joins together" these stones and builds them into the temple, which is a "dwelling place of God in the Spirit."

Here we come across the main problem of the temple image in the epistles, the uncertainty concerning the function of Jesus. It looks as if including Jesus as part of the building in Eph 2:20 is a secondary intrusion into an already existing image of the community as the temple. A decision with respect to 1 Pet 2 was not so easy, and we shall have to investigate further the question whether the living stone Jesus or the living stones the Christians represent the primary image. Otherwise we did not find in any of the Pauline temple passages a clear Christological reference, and one, 2 Cor 6:14-7:1, indicated a close parallel with the Qumran usage where the temple represents the community. The complexity of the image in 1 Pet 2 and Eph 2 seems to presuppose an extensive earlier development, and Paul's use of the image refers to it as something already known in order to make a specifically Pauline application. Accordingly, we shall look for further evidence of the conception of the congregation as the temple in the earliest church.

One of the most important texts in this connection is Gal 2:9, where Paul speaks of "James and Cephas and John, who were reputed to be pillars (οἱ δοκοῦντες στῦλοι εἶναι)."¹ From the way in which Paul speaks it is very clear that the title is not of his own choosing but was a designation of these three men given to them by the Jerusalem church. To be sure, just as a pillar is an important part of a building, so important men in general can be called pillars, as in the case of Jeremiah (Jer 1:18), R. Yohanan ben Zakkai (ARN 25), and Peter and Paul (1 Clem 5:2). In this case, however, it seems that more is involved than a mere metaphor. H. Schlier says, "Sachlich bedeutet die Kennzeichnung als στῦλοι dasselbe, wie

¹ Cf. C. K. Barrett, "Paul and the 'Pillar' Apostles." He is followed by J. Munck, *Petrus und Paulus in der Offenbarung Johannis*, Copenhagen, 1950, p. 20.

wenn sie das Fundament des himmlischen Baues der Kirche genannt werden."¹ In certain contexts the word pillar can come close to the concept of foundation, as when the world is said to be founded on pillars (Job 9:6; 26:11; 38:6; Ps 75:4), or when seven pillars provide the foundation for the heavenly house of wisdom (Prov 9:1; cf. Sir 24:4). Abraham is called the "pillar of the world" Ex Rab 2:6 in a passage evidently referring to the well-known Is 51:1, where Abraham is the "rock" from which Israel was hewn.² It is in this sense that James and Cephas and John are called pillars, which can be shown for each of them by other texts.

James the Just is called by Hegesippus "ὠβλίαν, that is in Greek περιτομή τοῦ λαοῦ."³ While the underlying Hebrew of this phrase is very obscure, the Greek in any case uses an architectural image, the "rampart of the people," that which holds the city together and defends it against its enemies. Simeon receives the name "rock" (כִּיפָא), the very name Cephas that Paul gives him in the text, and according to Mt 16:18 it is as the foundation stone of the new temple that he receives the name. There it is promised that the gates of hell will not prevail against the new temple and its foundation, and this promise together with such sayings as Mk 9:1 may lie behind the expectation that the author of the Fourth Gospel would not die (Jn 21:23). If this author is to be identified with the John of Gal 2:9 then we have perhaps corroboration also for his being thought of as part of the foundation of the new temple.

Gal 2:9 is then evidence that the leaders in Jerusalem were thought by the Jerusalem church to be the foundations of the new temple. While Paul is forced to recognize this, he tries to relativize their position. Barrett suggests that a polemic against the conception of the congregation as the temple is to be found in Galatians and elsewhere. Thus Paul speaks Gal 4:26 of the heavenly Jerusalem to act

¹ *Der Brief an die Galater*, Göttingen, 1951¹¹, p. 45; cf. Wilckens, *TWNT* VII, 732-736.

² "God said to him (Moses): 'you are standing in the place of the pillar of the world'" (p. 57 of the Soncino translation). Abraham is not even mentioned, which shows how self-evident the reference was.

³ Eusebius, *H.E.* II. xxiii. 7. On the problem of "Oblias" cf. H. J. Schoeps, "Jakobus ὁ δίκαιος καὶ ὠβλίαν," *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit*, Tübingen, 1950, pp. 120-125. He assumes that Hegesippus has misread שְׁלִיחַ "apostle" as עֲבָלִיחַ "Oblias" and צִיר "apostle" as צֹר "rock". This guess is just as wild as any which have been proposed. Since the meaning must be close to περιτομή τοῦ λαοῦ, if the door is open for wild guesses, I would like to suggest as the Hebrew source of "Oblias" the phrase יְסֹד לְעָם.

as a counterweight to the present Jerusalem church which had appropriated to herself the promises of the Zion tradition. It may be that when Paul says 1 Cor 3:11 that Jesus Christ is the one foundation he is not using a general metaphor but is referring specifically to the claim of the Jerusalem apostles to be the foundation. In any case our earlier conclusion has been supported, that the image of the community as the temple was known to Paul and often presupposed in his teaching, but that he himself had no interest in the image.

Another text where the Twelve are seen as foundations of the new temple is Rev 21:10ff, which describes "the holy city Jerusalem coming down out of heaven from God." The conception of the heavenly Jerusalem is here seen to be really the eschatological Jerusalem and is a development of the Zion tradition.¹ If in the tradition as a whole the presence of God was often transferred from the temple to the city, here we see the city described as a gigantic temple. "It is significant that within this city there is no temple (21:22); this is not because worship has no place in it but because, since God and the Lamb are in it, the whole city is as it were a temple (cf. 21:3 σκηνή, σκηνώσει; note also the cubical proportions of the city, and compare them with those of the Holy of Holies)"² The eschatological temple-Jerusalem stands in the same relation to the present community as the temple as the eschatological kingdom of God does to the present Lordship of Christ in the church. Thus though Revelation does not speak of the present community as the temple,³ what is said throughout the book concerning the heavenly temple corresponds not only to the Jerusalem temple but also at times to the image of the Christian community. In describing the eschatological Jerusalem-temple, Rev 21:14 says

¹ Cf. W. Rissi, *Die Zukunft der Welt. Eine exegetische Studie über Johannesoffenbarung 19, 11 bis 22, 15*, Basel, n.d. (1966?), pp. 54-59.

² Barrett, art. cit., p. 63; cf. J. T. Townsend, *The Jerusalem Temple in New Testament Thought* (Diss. Harvard), 1958, pp. 225-234; M. Rissi, *Zukunft*, p. 73.

³ Rev 11:1f may refer to the church under the image of the temple (so G. B. Caird, *The Revelation of St. John the Divine*, New York, 1966, p. 132), but it is more likely that it is all Israel which is here envisaged, cf. M. Rissi, "Das Judenproblem im Lichte der Johannesapokalypse," *ThZ* 13 (1957), 241-259. In either case a community is envisaged, but the image grows out of a tradition concerning the destruction of the temple and not the tradition which equates temple and community on the basis of God's dwelling there. Thus because of the quite different source of the image, Rev 11:1f is no exception to the general statement made in the text.

that "the wall of the city had twelve foundations (θεμελίους) and on them twelve names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb." Just as in Eph 2:20 the twelve make up the foundation of the church as a temple, so also in Rev 21 the twelve make up the foundation of the eschatological temple. Differing from Eph 2 but agreeing with what we surmised was the original form of the image there, Jesus is not part of the building in Rev 21, but he dwells in it along with God to give it its holiness.

There are several passages in the Pastorals which also presuppose that it is the church which is the foundation and not Christ. 1 Tim 3:15 speaks of instructions given "in order that you might know how to behave in the temple of God (ἐν οἴκῳ θεοῦ), which is the church of the living God, a pillar and foundation (στῦλος καὶ ἐδραίωμα) of the truth." The congregation as a whole (ἐκκλησία) is called the temple of God, and it may be that the pillar-foundation (hendiadys) is only a part of the building, namely Timothy.¹ However, the close parallel to Qumran, where we find the very phrase "foundation of the truth" (1QS V, 5; cf. VIII, 9; IX, 3f; 1QH VI, 25), makes it more likely that the church as a whole is somewhat inconsistently called both temple and foundation of the temple. There is no real contradiction involved when in Gal 2:9 the pillars are the three men Cephas, James, and John, and in Rev 3:12 every Christian can be a pillar ("He who conquers, I will make him a pillar in the temple of my God"), just as there is no contradiction between 1QS VII, 17, where only the council, and 1QSa I, 12, where all are foundations. Whether or not one thinks of the special functions assigned to certain people, it is still the community which is seen as the temple. In any case, it is clear that the standard image is being used in 1 Tim 3:15 and that there is no Christological reference in the foundation.

2 Tim 2:19 is important in that without any explicit citation it shows the basis of the New Testament image in Is 28:16, where the cornerstone carries an inscription. It is an unconscious reflection of this when 2 Tim says that "the firm foundation (θεμέλιος) of God stands, having this inscription: 'The Lord knows those who are his' and 'Let everyone naming the name of the Lord refrain from iniquity.'" In terms of the common image the foundation

¹ So J. Murphy-O'Connor, "La 'vérité' chez Saint Paul et à Qumran," *RB* 72 (1965), 29-76.

which God has laid¹ can only be the church as a whole. This is substantiated by the next verse, which goes on to speak of "a great house" in which are many vessels, whereby the "house" means unmistakably the church. The original image is fading and becoming almost only a figure of speech, but the Pastorals are still witnesses of an earlier image of the community as the temple of God.

We can add at this point a reference to 1 Pet 4:17, "for the time of the judgment beginning from the house of God (has come), and if it begins with us. . ." Without any explicit unfolding of the image of the temple, this text takes up the Old Testament concept (Jer 25:29; Ezek 9:6) that the judgment will begin with the temple and applies it to the congregation.² The identification can be simply presupposed as a concept well known to the readers. Thus the incidental reference 1 Pet 4:17 tells us more about the general Christian concept of the community as the temple than does the more complex development of 1 Pet 2:4ff.

The letter to the Hebrews is also witness to an early use of the image of the temple. In a *midrash* on Num 12:7, "my servant Moses is faithful in all my household (בֵּיתִי)," Hebrews 3:1-6 interprets the household as a house (οἶκος), i.e. the temple.³ Jesus is called "the builder of the house" (3:3) and the Son who is faithful over the house, as opposed to Moses who was only a servant faithful in the house (3:5f). The house is explicitly identified as the church: Jesus "whose house are we" (3:6). The most significant aspect of this text is the fact that the concept of the temple was probably not consciously present in the mind of the author at all. The concepts of the church as the temple and of Jesus as the builder of the temple are so much a part of the thought of the author that they come out even when he is discussing something quite different: Christ and Moses in their relationship to the household of God. This is more significant than an explicit discussion of the image would have been.⁴ When Hebrews does speak consciously in the Zion tradition, as in 12:18-24,⁵ it is more in the sense of the present anticipation

¹ Genitivus auctoris; cf. Pfammatter, *Bau*, p. 134.

² Cf. Michel *TWNT* V, 130, and Selwyn, *1 Peter*, pp. 299-303.

³ O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, Göttingen, 1957¹⁰, p. 98; Gärtner, *Temple*, p. 68.

⁴ Cf. also Heb 11:10, which says of Abraham that he "awaited the city having foundations, whose builder and creator is God."

⁵ On this cf. Gärtner, *Temple*, pp. 88-99.

of the heavenly Jerusalem. While a significant witness to the importance of the Zion tradition in general to the early church, this is not the same as the image we have been investigating.

A further development of the image of the community as the temple is found in the Apostolic Fathers. Ignatius, Eph 9:1, addresses the Christians as "being stones of the temple of the Father, prepared for the building of God the Father, carried up into the heights by the machine of Jesus Christ, which is the cross, using for a rope the Holy Spirit." Although Ignatius is very detailed about the crane, he tells us nothing of the foundation of the building. If *οικοδομή* is a *nomen actionis*, then God is thought to be the builder. Hermas on the other hand gives us a wealth of detail (Vis 3; Sim 9). The church is seen as a tower, which is undoubtedly the temple of En 90. The tower is built on a strong foundation, a square rock encompassing the whole world.¹ The stones used to build the tower are individual Christians, and they are allegorized in some detail. Hermas is especially interested in those who have been rejected for use in the building but still have a chance to repent. The Son of God is said to be the rock foundation (τὸ θεμέλιον Sim 9, 14, 6) on which the tower is built, but he is also called the gate through which one must enter. Even more important, in Sim 9, 12 the Son of God is the man who supervises the building of the tower and inspects the work. If the Son of God is the foundation in one passage, in Sim 9, 15, 4 the foundations (τὰ θεμέλια) are large stones representing men, on the lower level the ten men from Adam to Noah, on the next twenty-five just men (Shem to David?), on the third thirty-five prophets and servants of God, and on the fourth forty apostles and teachers of the early church. The word "foundation" is here used in two senses, 1. of the bedrock on which the whole is built, and 2. of the large stones placed on this bedrock which will support the smaller stones of the building itself. In spite of the fullness of new allegorical details, we can adduce Hermas as one more witness to the image of the church seen figuratively as the temple and built on the foundation of its leading men. There are other passages in the Apostolic Fathers which could also be discussed, but perhaps this is enough to show the universality of the image in the sub-apostolic church.

¹ The mythical origin of the image is obvious; cf. M. Dibelius, *Der Hirt des Hermas*, Tübingen, 1923, pp. 604ff.

Our survey so far has shown how widespread in the early church was the image of the community as the temple. Contrary to what has often been said, the image definitely does not seem to be a creation of Paul, nor even of the Hellenistic church. Passages such as Eph 2, 1 Pet 2, and Hermas in the very fullness of their use of the image suggest that they are developing an already existing concept. Paul refers to the image as something well known, and Gal 2 implies that it was a common image precisely in the Jerusalem church. Also the fact that the image is to be found in so many different New Testament writings would seem to point toward Jerusalem as a common center. One last argument will attempt to demonstrate that this is the case.

There is one final text which may indicate that the Jerusalem congregation understood itself as the temple. In Acts 15:16-18 James quotes a prophecy from Amos 9:11f which is so different from the Masoretic Text and so close to the LXX that most commentators¹ assume that the citation must therefore be an expression of a Hellenistic theology. However, they are so impressed with their linguistic discovery that they pay little attention to the content. As we shall see, the meaning of the citation has nothing to do with a Lucan theology, but is a prime example of the mission view of the Jerusalem church, that first Israel must receive their promised salvation and only then will the Gentiles be involved. Here is a dilemma, form vs. content, and we must find a way of eliminating one of the horns. The linguistic judgment has perhaps been all too hasty, and the question must be reopened. The Nestle text of Acts 15:15b-18 reads as follows:

- a) καθὼς γέγραπται: μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω
- b) καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν
- c) καὶ τὰ κατεστραμμένα αὐτῆς ἀνοικοδομήσω καὶ ἀνορθώσω αὐτήν
- d) ὅπως ἂν ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατὰλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν κύριον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς
- e) λέγει κύριος ποιῶν ταῦτα γνωστὰ ἀπ' αἰῶνος.

The points of verbal agreement with the Rahlfs LXX text have been spaced. They occur principally in line "d", which is thought to be especially significant because the sense of the MT is here so

¹ Typical is E. Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, Göttingen, 1959¹², pp. 388f, who has some very harsh words for those (Torrey, Zahn, Bruce, Munck) who would read the passage in any other way.

completely different. The latter says that God will raise up the fallen booth of David "so that they may possess the remnant of Edom and all the nations over whom my name is called," which seems to have very little to do with the LXX reading: "so that the remnant of men may seek (me)¹ and all the nations over whom my name is called." Nevertheless the LXX reading did not arise out of nothing, nor is it a simple mistake, but it is evidence of a certain interpretation within Israel of the Hebrew text. The translator has interpreted יִדְרְשׁוּ אֹתִי שְׂאֲרִית אֲדָם as if it said יִדְרְשׁוּ אֶת שְׂאֲרִית אֲדָם. The difference is one of only two letters and is of the kind (*daleth* next to *resh* and the addition of a *yod*) which often provides the basis of a conjectural reading in the apparatus of Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*. This is not to suggest that the LXX translator was a textual critic who restored the original meaning of an Amos text, for it seems that his different reading was deliberate and for the sake of quite a different meaning. We have recently learned from Qumran what we should have already known from Rabbinic exegesis, that such variant readings are often used and even created to bring out a different understanding of a text. The LXX reading is likely not to be isolated but to represent an understanding of the Hebrew text which was shared by others within Israel. The motives for this reading seem to have been to correct an Amos text in the light of the understanding of the Gentiles in relationship to Yahweh and Israel proclaimed by Deutero-Isaiah. We must emphasize that these same motives would have been even more important to the Jewish-Christian church represented by James!

It is then not necessary to assume that line "d" is a citation from the LXX, even if in our argument to this point this still remains the most likely explanation. But there are other questions to be taken into consideration. If line "d" was cited by Luke directly from the LXX, then this must apply to the other lines as well, and the differences between the two texts would have to be ascribed to mere inaccurate citation. If however these differences give evidence of an earlier use of the text not dependent on the LXX, then it will be likely that also line "d" had an earlier history as outlined above.

Amos 9:11 is twice cited in the Qumran texts in a form which differs slightly from the MT (4Qflor I, 12 and CD VII, 16):² the

¹ Although there is no reading $\mu\epsilon$ in any LXX text, it is assumed that the reading $\tau\omicron\nu\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ misreads אֹתִי as אֶת־יְהוָה.

² However, the Amos text found at Qumran (Benoit, Milik, de Vaux,

introductory note of time (ביום ההוא) is missing, and the citation begins with a *waw* which necessitates a change of tense (והקיימותי) for (אקים). On both of these points the text of Acts agrees with Qumran against both MT and LXX. One could also point to the fact that the introductory formula in both Acts and 4Qflor is the same: καθὼς γέγραπται = כאשר כתוב. These similarities have been pointed out by a number of scholars,¹ but they seem to me to be much too slight to justify any conclusions about "a common text tradition."² More important is the fact that in line "b" is a word which Acts does not share with any other text: ἀνοικαδομέω for the ἀνίστημι of LXX and the הקים of MT and Qumran.³ Before taking up this point let us look at some other verbal differences. Line "c" is in accord with neither LXX nor MT, both of which are made up of three clauses, but the general sense is the same. The difference shows that Luke did not actually look up the Amos passage to cite it but otherwise seems to allow of no particular conclusions. It is sometimes said that the words "after this I shall return" in line "a" are taken from Jer 12:15, but the reference is so vague and so short and so ignorant of the Jeremiah context as to render this extremely unlikely. On the other hand the words "make known from of old" in line "e" could very well come from Is 45:21, since the allusion is more definite and the context more appropriate.

The idea of an early Christian testimony book has been given added support by the discovery of such collections at Qumran.⁴ If there were such collections in the early church, then surely this Amos citation was part of one. First, it is introduced by the words "and with this the words of the prophets (pl.) agree, as is written. . ." Second, the words "after this I shall return", while not a testimonium

Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, II Les Grottes de Muraba'ât, Oxford, 1961, p. 188) does not differ at this point from the MT, an indication of a variant reading exploited for midrashic purposes.

¹ B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, Philadelphia, 1961, p. 35; M. Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts*, Oxford, 1965, p. 49; J. de Waard, *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament*, Leiden, 1965, pp. 24-26.

² de Waard, op. cit., p. 26.

³ It is difficult to understand why Wilcox, loc. cit., along with C. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents*, Oxford, 1954, pp. 29, should think that the reading of Acts is more in accord with CD VII, 16 than with Amos 9:11. To be sure, Acts has a καί, but the important thing is that the verb is different.

⁴ Cf. the balanced reassessment of J. A. Fitzmyer, "'4QTestimonia' and the New Testament," *Th. Stud.* 18 (1957), 513-537.

themselves, do seem to refer back to one. ταῦτα must have some antecedent, and this may have been a testimony concerning the appearance (or resurrection?) of Jesus. Finally, there is the reference to Is 45:21 at the end. Since there would be little point in tacking these few words onto the end of the Amos citation for their own sake, they may very well have been a transition in a testimony collection to Is 45:22, "Turn to me and be saved, all the ends of the earth." It is then very unlikely that Acts 15:16-18 is due simply to an impulse of Luke, who wanted to embellish the speech of James by a quotation from the LXX. The text Amos 9:11f may have belonged to an early Christian collection of testimonia, and it may have been originally quoted in a Hebrew version. A more fundamental question is why it was quoted at all.

If Luke had simply wanted a text from the LXX concerning the Gentile mission, it is difficult to imagine why he would have turned to Amos when so many better texts were available and more obvious. It is even harder to understand why the text should have been used in a modified Hebrew form, whether as part of a collection or in an isolated fashion, since it is impossible to make the text yield the desired result without doing violence to its original intention, and so many other texts would have been more suitable. The interest of the early church, therefore, could not have been in Amos 9:12, the text it was necessary to modify, but must have been in Amos 9:11, with Vs 12 added in order to bring out the progression: first Israel, then the Gentiles. The reason for this interest lies in the fact that the booth of David can be equated with the tabernacle in the wilderness and thus with the community as the temple, and Amos 9:11 is the only text which brings together both conceptions. The main thrust of the citation is clear, as Michaelis recognizes:¹ "Lukas versteht unter der bei Amos verheissenen und nunmehr eingetretenen Wiederaufrichtung der σκηνή Davids die Entstehung der christlichen Gemeinde. Hat der erste Teil der Weissagung 15, 16 sich an den Judenchristen erfüllt, so sollen diese überzeugt sein, dass auch ihr zweiter Teil 15, 17 sich erfüllt und die Heidenmission somit legitimiert ist." While this must be the general sense, there are still some important problems Michaelis has left unanswered. While the Gentile mission may be legitimized, the main emphasis is on erecting the fallen booth first, which James at any rate would

¹ *TWNT* VII, 375, 38-43.

not have seen as already fulfilled. The very un-Lucan conclusion drawn from the citation is not at all that the church should now turn to a Gentile mission, but rather only that some Gentiles may already now enter the church with no more obligations than those contained in the apostolic decree. Second, Luke otherwise never understands the congregation as a *σκηνή*, but this is exactly the understanding we found presupposed in Qumran, where this very passage Am 9:11 is quoted twice. In short, it is impossible to explain the presence of Am 9:11-12 in Acts 15 unless the use of this passage really does go back to the early Aramaic speaking congregation.

Amos 9:11f attracted itself to the attention of the church not because it mentions Gentiles in Vs 12 but because of the booth in Vs 11. This is perhaps indicated also by the change in wording in line "b". Both the MT (אֶקֶם) and the LXX (ἀναστήσω) speak of "erecting" a booth, but whenever one speaks of the temple, either in the literal or the figurative sense, the appropriate word would be "to build". This is exactly the word we find used in Acts 15, which is derived from no *Vorlage*: ἀνοικοδομήσω (= אִבְנֶה). It is because of the promise of God to build the booth=temple=congregation that the text Am 9:11 was first utilized by the church. Only later was Vs 12 also considered to say something important about the relationship of the church to the Gentiles. This is a theme which will occupy us in a later context, but for now we are interested mainly in the congregation as the temple. Acts 15:15-18 exhibits not a Lucan but a Jewish-Christian understanding, and even this understanding presupposes an earlier interest in Am 9:11 not because of the Gentiles but because of the equation "fallen booth of David" = "congregation of Jesus Christ." We hope to have shown that this is not only a Jewish-Christian conception but even a very early one.

We began where according to a common assumption one ought to begin, with the three explicit Pauline temple texts. However, we were not able to derive from them a specifically Pauline theology of the temple. The only one of these texts which was without problems, 2 Cor 6:14-7:1, which contains exactly the same conceptions as Qumran, is for this very reason suspect of being non-Pauline. The texts 1 Cor 6:19f; 3:16f, and perhaps 2 Cor 5:1 presuppose the concept of the community as the temple as well known, but at the same time they contain characteristic Pauline modifications. The image certainly did not originate with Paul. We found the image presupposed in such diverse writings as Rev 21:3, 14; 1 Tim 3:15; 2 Tim 2:19; 1 Pet 4:

17; Heb 3:1-6; Ignatius, Eph 9:1; and Hermas, Sim 9. The common centre which must be presupposed for such diverse texts can only be the Jerusalem congregation. In addition, Gal 2:9 and Acts 15:16-18 seem to be more direct evidence that the concept was held in Jerusalem at an early date. The testimony of the New Testament epistles is thus ambiguous and seems to point back to an earlier conception. There is also the problem that such texts as 1 Pet 2:4ff and Eph 2:19ff seem to combine two conceptions: one in which the congregation is the temple, and another in which this temple is Jesus. We must attempt to determine which is prior, the Christological or the ecclesiological use of the image of the temple. We turn first to Christology and find that many of the Christological tendencies of the New Testament epistles find their unambiguous fruition in the gospel of John.

C. Jesus as the Temple in the Fourth Gospel

The temple was understood within Israel to represent primarily the place of the presence of God, but also as the place where atonement for sin was effected and as the sign of the gracious election of God. Everything the Old Testament says about the foundation of the temple is in the New Testament applied to the person of Jesus Christ. It should therefore cause no surprise to see that the New Testament church can speak explicitly of Jesus as the new temple of God. We have already seen the tendency in the temple passages of the epistles, of which 1 Pet 2 and Eph 2 are especially important. There, however, the identification of Jesus with the temple is complicated by being associated with another identification, that of the temple with the community. Indeed, if we look for unambiguous statements of the identification of Jesus as the locus of the presence of God with the temple, these are surprisingly to be found only in the Fourth Gospel.

In Jesus "the whole fullness of God dwells bodily" (Col 2:9; cf. 1:19). This is a statement which the Fourth Gospel could very well have made, but there are also important differences. Whether or not the *πλήρωμα* is to be attributed to proto-Gnostic opponents in Colossae, there is no direct reference to God's dwelling in the temple either. Apart from direct references to the *ναός*, we must look for elements that were specifically associated with the temple in Judaism. There are certain concepts which are directly associated with God's dwelling in the temple. If Deuteronomy spoke of the name

of God dwelling in Jerusalem, the Priestly writings took up the older conception associated with the tent of meeting and spoke of the glory of God dwelling within Israel.¹ It is a further development of the idea of the *kabod* of God when the Rabbis speak of the Shekinah² as the dwelling of God, pre-eminently in the temple. While the concept of the Spirit of God is usually associated with prophecy and power, it too can on occasion be used in the sense of Shekinah.³ Only if we find passages which speak of Jesus as the dwelling place of God with specific reference to such concepts as glory, Shekinah, or Spirit, or which otherwise use recognized temple themes, are we justified in speaking of the image of Jesus as the temple in the Fourth Gospel.

The passage which can perhaps best show John's understanding, because it speaks explicitly of the *ναός*, is the story of the cleansing of the temple in Jn 2:13-22. John's own interpretation will also stand out all the more because the pericope deals with a story (Mk 11:15-18) and saying (Mk 14:58) we have already discussed. Just after the act itself, it is said that Jesus' disciples "remembered" a passage from the passion Psalm 69:9, "zeal for thy house shall consume me." Already now the specific Johannine interpretation in terms of the death of Jesus has been introduced: Jesus was killed because of his great zeal for the house of God. This interpretation was "remembered" in the light of Jesus' death and resurrection, and the source is not so much reflection on any events of Jesus' life as on the significance of a passage from a psalm widely used by the early church to explain Jesus' death. Then when Jesus is asked for a sign to demonstrate his authority so to act in the temple, he replies with a variant of the famous temple saying, "destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." Specific to this passage is the use of the verb *εγείρω* instead of *οικοδομέω* and the fact that the destruction is referred to the hearers instead of Jesus himself. The hearers misunderstand Jesus' saying to refer to Herod's temple, but the evangelist tells us very plainly that Jesus "spoke of the temple which is his body." Again, it is only

¹ Cf. G. von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments* I, München, 1958, pp. 233-240.

² Cf. Kittel, *TWNT* II, 248-250, and J. Abelson, *The Immanence of God in Rabbinic Literature*, London, 1912.

³ Cf. Abelson, *op. cit.*, pp. 377f; G. F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*, I, Cambridge (Mass.), 1927, p. 437; W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, London, 1955², pp. 213f.

after Jesus had been raised (ἐγέρθη) from the dead that they "remembered" Jesus' saying. Then they believed it and the scriptures (cf. 1 Cor 15:3f, "Jesus died. . . was raised. . . in accordance with the scriptures").

As we saw, the specifics of the temple saying here are due to the memory of the disciples and their particular interpretation. The temple is Jesus' body, which can more appropriately be said to be raised than built, and therefore also the destruction must be attributed to Jesus' enemies and not to himself. The sense of the imperative is neither ironic nor concessive but future.¹ We can then reformulate the saying in accordance with the explicit statement of the text: "you will destroy my body and in three days I will raise it up." The identification could not be plainer: the temple *is* Jesus' body. Whatever the saying may originally have meant, in the understanding of Jn 2:21 the ναός is not the Jerusalem temple nor is it the Christian community, but it is the body of Jesus.²

Commentators in general have not been satisfied with this explanation but have tried to connect the temple saying here with the similar saying found in the Synoptic Gospels. Thus Dubarle³ surely has the Markan version in mind when he insists on the fact that the first half of the saying must predict the destruction of the Jerusalem temple. The prophecy he says must have some reference to the situation of the cleansing of the Jerusalem temple, and thus he wants to connect the ναός of the saying Vs 19 with the ἱερόν of the setting Vs 14. No one would have understood the words "this temple" to refer to Jesus' body (unless perhaps the saying were accompanied by a gesture pointing to himself, a grotesque idea) and his hearers must have understood it of the temple building at hand. The first half of the saying would then refer to the Jerusalem temple and the second half to Jesus' body.

¹ Cf. above, p. 71.

² Wenschkewitz, *Spiritualisierung*, pp. 97-101, is led to the claim that the Johannine version of the saying is more original than Mk 14:58 in order to save his thesis that the congregation was identified with the temple only since Paul. A similar claim for the relative priority of John is made by Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, Göttingen, 1959¹⁶, p. 89, n. 7, and by C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge, 1953, p. 302, n. 1 (but cf. the correction in his *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge, 1963, p. 91). Against all such attempts, cf. S. Mendner, "Die Tempelreinigung," ZNW 47 (1956), 93-112.

³ A. M. Dubarle, "Le signe du Temple," RB 48 (1939), 21-44.

O. Cullmann¹ recalls the purposeful ambiguity of words in this gospel² and suggests that *ναός* means here all three: temple, physical body of Jesus, and body of Christ = the church. The interpretation of the body of Christ here as the church is especially popular³ because of the Pauline usage and because the church in addition is called the temple in documents associated with Ephesus (Eph, 1-2 Cor), the presumed place of writing of this gospel. While the physical body of Jesus is included, the first half of the saying would then refer primarily to the Jerusalem temple and the second half to the church as the body of Christ.

Such interpretations, instructive as they may be in other respects, are unsatisfactory as expositions of the Fourth Gospel. The two halves of the saying really have to refer to the same temple, whatever difficulties this might seem to cause. To separate them causes even more difficulties, for can it really be said that the resurrection of Jesus or the establishment of the church will not occur until after the destruction of the Jerusalem temple? It is beside the point that John knew of a prediction of the destruction of the temple (11:48), and we can assume that he also knew of the church as the body of Christ and the new temple. He may even have known that destruction and new temple were united in a saying similar to Mk 14:58. His knowledge only makes more significant the fact that he did not choose to understand the saying in this way but rather of the physical body of Christ. It is probable that even today interpreters are still confusing the tasks of elucidating the text and trying plausibly to reconstruct an event in the life of Jesus. Bultmann is in a sense especially guilty of this when he ascribes the specific Johannine understanding to a redactor while the temple saying is interpreted in connection with other texts to mean the eschatological destruction and rebuilding of the Jerusalem temple.⁴ Léon-Dufour⁵ has indicated the proper approach when he separates his

¹ *Urchristentum und Gottesdienst*, Zürich, 1950², pp. 72-76. He even suggests, p. 74, a fourth reference: the eucharistic body, as does Dubarle, art. cit., p. 29.

² Cf. his "Der johanneische Gebrauch doppeldeutiger Ausdrücke als Schlüssel zum Verständnis des vierten Evangeliums," *ThZ* 4 (1948), 360-372.

³ E.g. O. Michel, *Das Zeugnis des Neuen Testaments von der Gemeinde*, Gütersloh, 1941, pp. 56, 80; C. H. Dodd, *Fourth Gospel*, p. 302.

⁴ *Johannes*, p. 89.

⁵ X. Léon-Dufour, "Le signe du temple selon Saint Jean," *Rech. sci. rel.* 39 (1951-52), 155-175; cf. also his references, p. 171, to other passages in the Fourth Gospel where Jesus is the temple.

discussion of what the saying Jn 2:19 might have meant to Jesus' hearers and what it means in the present text of John, after the disciples had "remembered". It is only this second level in which we are interested here. If John knew the saying in an earlier form and knew that the new temple meant for some the Christian congregation as the body of Christ, it is all the more significant that he should choose to interpret it consistently of the physical body of Jesus. "But he spoke of the temple which is his body."

This one clear identification can open our eyes for others which are not quite so explicit. Neither are they so important for our present purposes, so our discussion can be brief.

Jn 1:14. "And the word became flesh and tabernacled (ἐσκήνωσεν) among us, and we beheld his glory (δόξαν), glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth." In spite of Bultmann's objection it seems best to understand the Logos of the prologue in terms of the wisdom tradition of Judaism.¹ Very significant then as a parallel is Sir 24:8-10, where Wisdom says, "the one who created me assigned a place for my tent and said: 'tabernacle (κατασκήνωσον) in Jacob, and enter into your inheritance in Israel. . .'. In the holy tabernacle (σκηνῇ ἁγίᾳ) I served before him and thus was established in Zion." If in Sirach wisdom dwells in the temple, in the Old Testament it is the *kabod*, glory of God (Ex 24:15f; 40:34; 1 Kg 8:10f; Ezek 9:23; 44:4), while in the Targums it is God's glory, *yeqara*, or his presence, Shekinah. The translators of the LXX were thinking of the Shekinah when they choose a word with the same radicals s-k-n to designate God's dwelling: σκηνώω. Relevant here is the usage of Rev 7:15 and 21:3, for the presence of God is connected neither with the Jerusalem temple nor with the Christian community but with the dwelling of God and the Lamb. Also the grace and truth, חסד ואמת, come from Sinai (Ex 34:6), when the glory took up dwelling in the tabernacle.² Thus the concepts of wisdom, Shekinah, glory all combine to show that Jn 1:14 sees in Jesus the presence of God previously associated with the temple.³

¹ So Dodd, *Fourth Gospel*, pp. 263-285; R. E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John* (i-xii), New York, 1966, pp. cxxii-cxxv; F. M. Braun, "Saint Jean, la Sagesse et l'histoire," *Neotestamentica et Patristica*, Leiden, 1962, pp. 123-133; W. D. Davies, *Paul*, pp. 147-176; A. Richardson, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament*, New York, 1958, pp. 155-168.

² Cf. Dodd, *Fourth Gospel*, pp. 175f, 272; and 1QS IX, 3ff.

³ Cf. Cullmann, *Gottesdienst*, p. 74; Brown, *John*, pp. 31-35.

Jn 1:51. "Amen, Amen, I say to you, you will see the heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending on the Son of Man." It is generally agreed that this saying is based on Jacob's dream Gen 28:12, read in accordance with the Rabbinic interpretation (Gen Rab 69:3), whereby the angels ascend and descend on Jacob.¹ Whether we are to think of the stone and of Bethel as the house of God,² or more generally of a Merkabah mysticism,³ Jesus is here seen as the place where earth and heaven meet, the place of the presence of God (Targum: his יקרא), the temple. The use of the title Son of Man may indicate some contact of this saying with Mk 14:62,⁴ and may be an indication of a collective interpretation of Son of Man.⁵ But however we are to interpret the details of the saying, it is clear in a general way that Jesus has taken the place of the temple.

Jn 4:21-23. Jesus said to the woman of Samaria, "believe me, woman, that the hour is coming when you will worship the Father neither on this mountain (Gerizim) nor in Jerusalem. . . the hour is coming and now is, when the true worshippers will worship the Father in spirit and truth." The worship of the Jerusalem temple as of Mt. Gerizim is here replaced with something else. This something else is of course not an individual inner "spiritual" religion,⁶ but the Spirit of truth, the Holy Spirit which Jesus gives (the living water, Vs 14). R. Schnackenburg⁷ has shown how in Qumran God's Spirit purifies men so as to make them the foundation of his truth and the new temple in which he dwells. This is the conception found here except that John places all the emphasis on him who is

¹ כּוֹר, referring to the ladder, is ambiguous. There is no need to bring in Gnostic parallels here as do H. Odeberg, *The Fourth Gospel*, Uppsala, 1929, pp. 33ff, and Bultmann, *Johannes*, pp. 74f.

² J. Jeremias, "Die Berufung des Nathanael," *Angelos* 3 (1928), 2-5.

³ G. Quispel, "Nathanael und der Menschensohn (Joh 1, 51)," *ZNW* 47 (1956), 281-283.

⁴ So R. E. Brown, *John*, p. 89.

⁵ So Odeberg, loc. cit., and Dodd, *Fourth Gospel*, pp. 241-246.

⁶ "Auf keinen Fall darf man Joh 4, 22-26 spiritualistisch verstehen. Die Anbetung in Wort, im Geist, in der Wahrheit ist wirklich eine Anbetung 'in Christus' und kann nach urchristlicher Überzeugung nur in der Gliedschaft der Gemeinde Jesu Christi ausgeübt werden," Michel, *Gemeinde*, p. 24; cf. also Bultmann, *Johannes*, p. 140. Unfortunately, Dodd, *Fourth Gospel*, pp. 313f, tends in this direction.

⁷ "Die 'Anbetung in Geist und Wahrheit' (Joh 4, 23) im Lichte von Qumran-Texten," *BZ* 3 (1959), 88-94.

the truth and gives the Spirit. Also with respect to worship then Jesus is the temple.¹

Jn 7:37-39. "On the last day of the festival, the great day, Jesus stood and cried out: 'If anyone thirsts let him come to me, and let him drink who believes in me; as the scripture says: "out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water."' This he said concerning the Spirit which those who believed in him were about to receive. For the Spirit was not yet, because Jesus was not yet glorified." Once more we must begin with the explicit interpretation of the evangelist: the saying refers to the giving of the Holy Spirit by the glorified Jesus.² The association of the Spirit with living water is explicit in 4:10; 3:5; cf. Ezek 36:25f; 1QS IV, 21; 1 Jn 5:6-8. We are interested here in the identification of Jesus as the source of the living water. While the scriptural quotation cannot be documented, the general conception can be. The indispensable background for understanding this passage is the water libation at the festival of Tabernacles.³ As part of a rain-encouraging ceremony water was carried in a solemn procession from the spring of Gihon to the temple, where it was poured out on the foundation stone. The reason is that it was from this stone that the world was watered, just as it was from this stone that the eschatological water of life would flow. The conception which lies behind our text is that of Zech 14:8, a Tabernacles text, "on that day living waters shall flow out from Jerusalem" (cf. Ezek 47:1ff), or of Rev 22:1, "the river of the water of life, bright as crystal, flowing from the throne of God and the Lamb." That the rivers of living water are said to flow from Jesus' belly is strange, but the most likely explanation is that the conception has been modified in accordance with 19:34, where blood and water come out from Jesus' side.⁴ In any case the identification of Jesus with the temple is clearly intended. The general conception is that the waters of life flow from the temple (foundation stone),

¹ Cf. Cullmann, *Gottesdienst*, pp. 82-86.

² Although it is possible to translate the passage in such a way that the water flows from the believer, there would then be no Old Testament background at all, and it is only Jesus who gives the Holy Spirit (Jn 20:22); cf. Bultmann, *Johannes*, p. 228; Dodd, *Fourth Gospel*, p. 349.

³ On this see Suk 10:9f; Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, II, 774-812; J. Jeremias, *Golgotha und der heilige Felsen*, Angelos-Beiheft 1, Leipzig, 1926, pp. 60-65, 80-84; R. Patai, *Man and Temple in Ancient Jewish Myth and Ritual*, London, 1947.

⁴ So Jeremias, *Golgotha*, p. 82; Dodd, *Fourth Gospel*, p. 349.

but John says that they flow from Jesus; hence Jesus is the temple (foundation stone).¹

It has often been suggested that the Fourth Gospel presents Jesus as the fulfillment and replacement of various institutions of Judaism. In particular, this may be the reason for the mention of the various feasts: Sabbath, Passover, Tabernacles.² Also the festival of Dedication is mentioned Jn 10:22-39, which celebrated the renewal (ἐγκαίνια, חנוכה) or the consecration (ἀγιάζω, Pi of קדש (Num 7:1)) of the temple at the time of the Maccabees. It is at this festival that Jesus claims to be he "whom the Father consecrated and sent into the world" (Vs 36). This is surely no mere coincidence. If during the celebration of the consecration of the temple Jesus can say that he has been consecrated, then he has effectively taken the place of the temple. Jesus is the temple insofar as he has been consecrated as the dwelling place of God, and so he can say that "the Father is in me and I in the Father" (Vs 38).

Jn 12:41 says that "Isaiah said this (Is 6:9f) when he saw his glory, and he spoke about him," whereby the antecedent of the pronouns must be Jesus. Neither the MT nor the LXX speak about glory, but the Targum of Is 6:5 says that Isaiah saw "the glory of the Shekinah of Yahweh" in the temple. This passage then rather incidentally identifies Jesus with the Shekinah, a conception which pervades the Fourth Gospel and one so obvious to the author that it does not need to be formally expounded. Also in 2:11 and 17:5 Jesus manifests his glory = the Shekinah. Thus it is likely that a Shekinah theology lies behind those passages (10:38; 14:23; 17:23, 26) where the unity of Jesus and the Father are proclaimed.³ For the Fourth Gospel it is primarily in Jesus that God dwells and not in the community as in Qumran.

We have perhaps said enough to indicate that for the Fourth Gospel Jesus takes the place of the temple. It is a concept natural enough in the church, and it would not be surprising to find other indications of it. Especially the concept of glory seems to refer to

¹ Bultmann, *Johannes*, p. 230 (cf. p. 75), complains against Jeremias that the foundation stone is not explicitly mentioned; but surely this is not necessary. If the water libation ceremony was in the mind of the author the connection would be obvious; if not then Jesus is still the temple in general.

² On these festivals cf. F. M. Braun, "In spiritu et veritate," *Rev. Thom.* 52 (1952), 245-274, especially pp. 255-266.

³ So Odeberg, *Fourth Gospel*, p. 332.

the Shekinah of God who dwells in Jesus: cf. the whole passage 2 Cor 3:7 - 4:6, ending with the statement that God has given "the light of the knowledge of the glory (Shekinah) of God in the face of Christ."¹ There may well be, as Jeremias² claims, a connection between the statement of 1 Cor 10:4 that Christ was the rock from which Israel drank in the wilderness and the foundation rock of the temple as the source of living water (Jn 7:37f). In Hebrews Jesus takes over in detail all the functions of the temple, even though the identification is not explicit as in John because of the concept of the heavenly temple. In short, the whole doctrine of the incarnation, insofar as it has biblical roots, goes back to an understanding of Jesus as the dwelling place of God or the Shekinah, i.e. the temple.³

We have seen then how natural it would be for the early church to think of Jesus in terms derived from the temple. On the other hand, numerous passages in the New Testament epistles say that the community is the temple, thus agreeing with the image as used at Qumran. It is not easy to determine which usage is primary. B. Gärtner⁴ says that the Christological interpretation, "which is grounded in Jesus' interpretation of his own Messiahship as recorded in the Gospels, suggests that the source of the New Testament interpretation of the 'new' temple is to be sought in the self consciousness of Jesus—his desire to be the Messiah and break through the Jewish religion and its cultus." With the exception of 2 Cor 6:14 - 7:1, all of the temple texts in the epistles have also a Christological orientation. The other aspect, that of the community as the temple, would then be a secondary importation from Qumran into a tradition of Jesus' teaching which spoke of himself as the temple. The correctness of such a reconstruction of the history of the tradition must now be subject to a closer examination.

D. *The Stone and the Foundation*

In our investigation to this point we have encountered a serious dilemma with which we must now attempt to deal. It was the fre-

¹ Cf. also 1 Cor 2:8, where Jesus is called "the Lord of glory", and perhaps Eph 1:17, if we are to translate the epithet of God as "Father of glory", i.e. Father of Christ.

² *Golgotha*, p. 84.

³ Cf. "The Doctrine of the Shekinah and the Theology of the Incarnation" in Burrows, *The Gospel of the Infancy*, London, 1940, pp. 101-110.

⁴ *Temple*, p. 104.

quency and inner agreement of many passages in the church fathers under precisely this theme, that Christ is the stone, which led Rendel Harris to his hypothesis of an early Christian testimony book.¹ In the New Testament Jesus is repeatedly called the stone: Mk 12:10 par; Lk 20:18; Acts 4:11; Rm 9:32f; 1 Pet 2:4-8; Eph 2:20; Jn 7:37ff; 1 Cor 10:4. On the other hand the image is applied only once to someone else, to Peter in Mt 16:18. Both conceptions are combined in 1 Pet 2:4f, where Jesus is called the "living stone" but it seems that the Christians are called "living stones" only as "Abbilder ihres Herrn."² At first glance the evidence seems overwhelming that the application of the stone image to Christians must be secondary. The weight of proof rests on us if we would like to maintain the contrary view.

The situation with respect to the foundation is not quite so one sided. It is true that in modern times the conception that "the church's one foundation is Jesus Christ her Lord" is almost universal, and that K. L. Schmidt in his article in the *TWNT* speaks almost exclusively of "das Fundament Christus."³ In the New Testament, however, Jesus is the foundation only in 1 Cor 3:11 and perhaps Jn 7:37ff; 1 Cor 10:4, while he shares this role with others in Eph 2:20 and Hermas, and in Mt 16:18; Gal 2:9; Rev 21:14; 2 Tim 2:19 the apostles are the foundation. We have then a problem in the history of tradition to try to show which application is primary and which a latter development.

One of the drawbacks of Kittel's *TWNT* is that it contains separate articles on θεμέλιος, λίθος, πέτρα, and ἀκρογωνιαίος. We however are not interested in words as much as an image, and so we shall discuss all of these words together. Important in any discussion of foundations and stones is an understanding of ancient building techniques.⁴ A. Fridrichsen⁵ refers to an ancient Greek building text in which the "Baugrund" is called ἔδαφος, while the "Grundmauer" is the θεμέλιον, made up of large blocks of stone which can be called τὰ θεμέλια. The builder first places these large stones for the foun-

¹ *Testimonies*, Cambridge, I, 1916, II, 1920.

² Jeremias, *Golgotha*, p. 85.

³ *TWNT*, III, 63f. At the risk of seeming disloyal to my alma mater, perhaps I should also point out that I must dissent from the motto of the theological faculty of the University of Basle: fundamentum Christus.

⁴ This is rightly emphasized by Pfammatter, *Bau*, pp. 140-143, who even draws on architectural opinion.

⁵ "Themelios, 1 Kor. 3, 11," *ThZ* 2 (1946), 316-317.

dation, and then the superstructure of smaller stones or bricks is built on top of it. This is the situation described in Lk 6:48, which tells of "a man building a house, who dug deep (ἔσκαψεν καὶ ἐβάθυνεν) and set the foundation (ἐθηκεν θεμέλιον) on the bedrock (πέτραν)." We also hear of a foundation being set in 1 Cor 3:10 and Rm 15:20. On the other hand, the situation presupposed by Luke is of a man building on sandy soil, where it is necessary to provide by means of large blocks a firm foundation, a situation which would not prevail in a place where the bedrock is exposed. Thus in the parallel Mt 7:24 the man "built his house on the bedrock (πέτραν)." This man was fortunate enough to have a natural foundation so that it was not necessary for him to set up large blocks. This bedrock can also be called the foundation, as in Mt 16:18 and Hermas, Sim. 9, 14, 6. Thus depending of the context the foundation θεμέλιος can be synonymous with the bedrock (πέτρα, כִּפֶּא) or with the foundation stones (λίθος, אֶבֶן but also כִּפֶּא). In the latter case, the most important part of the foundation would be the cornerstone.

The meaning of (λίθος) ἀκρογωνιαίος is unclear. The element γωνία refers to a corner, but ἄκρος could mean either *extremus* or *summus*. The word seems to have been coined by the LXX to translate פֶּנֶה in Is 28:16. This Hebrew word means simply corner, but אֶבֶן פֶּנֶה, stone of the corner, in Jer 51:26; Job 38:9 means clearly cornerstone. In view of the inscription it is not to be doubted that also Is 28:16 refers to a cornerstone. Quite a different stone is intended in Zech 4:7-10: "The hands of Zerubbabel have laid the foundations of this house; his hands shall also complete it. . . he shall bring forward the capstone (הָאֶבֶן הָרִאשִׁי, LXX λίθος τῆς κληρονομίας?) amid shouts of 'grace, grace to it.' " Both because of the linguistic similarities to this text (cf. also Ps 24:7) and because of its own context, it is probable that a capstone is meant also in Ps 118:22, "the stone which the builders have rejected has become the capstone (רִאשִׁי פֶּנֶה, κεφαλὴ γωνίας)."

In a series of articles¹ J. Jeremias has argued that ἀκρογωνιαίος in the New Testament must mean "capstone", the last stone to be put in place on a building. He is able to cite a very impressive array of post-Christian sources (especially important is the detailed

¹ "Der Eckstein," *Angelos* 1 (1925), 65-70; "κεφαλὴ γωνίας — ἀκρογωνιαίος," *ZNW* 29 (1930), 264-280; "Eckstein — Schlussstein," *ZNW* 36 (1937), 154-157; *TWNT* I, 792-793; IV, 272-283.

picture of Test. Sol. 22:7 - 23:3) where the word clearly does have this meaning.¹ Nevertheless, even Jeremias is forced to admit that in the one pre-Christian passage, Is 28:16 LXX, the word does mean "cornerstone".² Should we interpret the New Testament usages in accordance with the earlier or the later understanding? It seems that nothing can be said on the basis of philology alone, and that the meaning will have to be determined from the several contexts.³

We shall begin with Acts 4:9-12, where we see how Ps 118 began to be used by the early church. Peter tells the authorities of the Jerusalem temple that they crucified Jesus of Nazareth, but God raised him from the dead (Vs 10). As a scriptural proof the Psalm is cited: "He is the stone which was rejected by you builders, which has become the capstone" (Vs 11). We see that the passage functions as part of the passion apologetic of the early church. Jesus is capstone insofar as he has been raised, but the main emphasis is not on the resurrection but to explain how Jesus' rejection was in accordance with scripture. Ps 118:22 is not inappropriate in this connection. As a psalm which praises God for salvation after a period of suffering and persecution, Ps 118 like Ps 22 can be aptly applied to Jesus' death and resurrection. The image may imply that the stone rejected by the builders has been lying unused near the site until at the last it is set into the building. It is then a capstone more than a cornerstone. It should also be noted that Vs 22 is only an analogy from the field of building in general and that there is no reference to building the temple. The kind of building is not the point of comparison but the use in an honored place of a stone which had been rejected. B. Lindars⁴ has given an impressive analysis of this theme of the rejected stone as part of the passion apologetic which explains why Jesus was not recognized as Messiah but rather killed. An important corollary is that these stone passages are part of the apologetic theology of the church based on Jesus' death and resurrection, and are in no sense genuine sayings of Jesus.

Ps 118 has been used in several places in the gospel tradition.

¹ The evidence is not all on one side, however. Cf. the passages where it was understood as cornerstone cited by G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford, 1961ff, p. 66. Cf. also *Gospel of Thomas*, log. 66.

² *TWNT*, IV, 278, n. 64.

³ Against the thesis of Jeremias, cf. also the arguments of R. J. McKelvey, "Christ the Cornerstone," *NTS* 8 (1962), 352-359.

⁴ *New Testament Apologetic*, Philadelphia, 1961, pp. 169-186.

The word "rejected" (ἐξουδενηθείς, ἀποδοκιμασθείς) has entered into the predictions of the passion Mk 8:31; 9:12. Vs 26a, "blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord," appears not only at the entry into Jerusalem Mk 11:9f, but also in the lament over Jerusalem Lk 13:35. It is likely that both passages represent the theology of the early church rather than an event in the life of Jesus. The same is true of the addition¹ to the parable of the workers in the vineyard Mk 12:10f. The parable itself is an allegory in which Jesus castigates the temple authorities for not serving Israel faithfully, an unfaithfulness which will culminate in Jesus' own death. Vs 9 seems to be a Markan addition² referring to the destruction of Jerusalem and the Gentile-Christian church. Vs 10 is a further addition, but a very appropriate one, in which a basic scriptural testimony to the rejection of Jesus is applied to a parable in which Jesus also spoke of his rejection: "the stone which the builders rejected has become the capstone; this has come from the Lord and it is marvellous in our eyes." The raising of the rejected stone refers of course just as in Acts 4:11 to the resurrection of Jesus, which has already occurred (it "has come" (ἐγένετο) from the Lord"). When Jeremias speaks of the parousia, he is not interpreting this passage at all but thinking of what he would like to claim for Eph 2.³ Once more we note that the passage does not suggest any connection with the temple whatsoever. The emphasis is on the raising of a rejected stone and not on the kind of building in which it is set. None of the characteristics of the temple which we saw in the Qumran usage are present here. There is no thought of holiness or of being firmly established or of atonement or of any other attribute of the temple. We must conclude then that passages based on Ps 118:22 deal only with Jesus' rejection and resurrection and should be excluded from our consideration of the temple image in the New Testament.

Is 8:14f is never cited alone in the New Testament. The passage reads: "He (Yahweh) will be a sanctuary (מִקְדָּשׁ), and a stone of

¹ Jeremias, *TWNT*, IV, 277, claims the citation as a genuine saying of Jesus, an assertion he abandoned in *Die Gleichnisse Jesu*, Göttingen, 1956⁴, p. 62.

² So Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, London, 1935, p. 127; but cf. Jeremias, *Gleichnisse*, p. 64, who maintains that Vs 9 belongs to the original parable and that the "others" to whom the care of the vineyard is given are the πτωχοί of Israel.

³ *TWNT*, IV, 278; *Gleichnisse*, p. 62.

offense and a rock of stumbling to both houses of Israel, a trap and a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. And many shall stumble thereon; they shall fall and be broken." Here there is temple imagery applied to Yahweh, who will be a sanctuary, firmly established, to those who trust, but a stumbling block, an agent of judgment, for those who do not trust. Rm 9:32f and 1 Pet 2:8 both quote phrases from Is 8 in connection with Is 28, but, and this must be especially noted, they do not quote the words about a sanctuary at all but only the stumbling block and stone of offense. In connection with the inscription on the cornerstone Is 28:16, "he who trusts will not yield," their use of Is 8 is quite appropriate. Jesus is presented not as the temple but as the occasion of belief or disbelief. The sense is not unlike Lk 2:34, "Behold, he (Jesus) is set for the fall or rising of many in Israel and as a sign that is spoken against." We have found in the use of Is 8:14 a second use of the stone image in the New Testament, one which like Ps 118:22 has nothing to do with the temple at all. However, Is 8:14 always appears in connection with Is 28:16, which does speak of the temple, and this is the text on which the issue will be decided.

Is 28:16ff reads as follows: "Behold, I lay a foundation in Zion, a tested stone, a precious cornerstone of the foundation: 'he who trusts will not yield.' And I will make justice the line and righteousness the plummet. . . . Then your covenant with death will be annulled and your agreement with Sheol will not stand." Because the foundation is to be laid in Zion and because firmness against all enemies belongs to the Zion tradition, it seems probable that the idea of the temple is present. The point of introducing it here is that faith in Yahweh will keep the believer firmly established and protected, whereas alliance with Egypt will not. The פִּנֵּה on which the inscription is written must in this passage be the cornerstone,¹ and in view of the content of the inscription, it comes close to representing the whole foundation. The building which is built is trust, justice, righteousness,² and if anything further is intended then it is the remnant, the "redeemed community",³ and definitely not

¹ Cf. J. Lindblom, "Der Eckstein in Jes. 28, 16," *Norsk Theol. Tids.* 56 (1955), 123-132; we omit with him the doublets of אֶבֶן and מוֹסָד.

² Lindblom, art. cit.

³ S. H. Hooke, "The Corner-Stone of Scripture," *The Siege Perilous*, London, 1956, pp. 235-249; cf. M. Noth, "Jerusalem und die israelitische Tradition," *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, München, 1957, pp. 172-187, p. 183; in Is 28:16 is "unter dem Bilde eines neu zu errichtenden Baues

the Messiah.¹ It is important to emphasize this point because Jeremias² claims that the application of the stone passages to the Messiah is pre-Christian. It is true that LXX translates the inscription as ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ καταισχυνθῇ, but the words ἐπ' αὐτῷ very likely come from the New Testament understanding. The Targum to the passage reads: "Behold I will appoint in Zion a king, a strong king, says the prophet, but the righteous who have believed in these things shall not be dismayed when distress comes." The evidence from Qumran would seem to indicate that this too is a post-Christian interpretation, as definitely are the other passages Jeremias cites where the Messiah is called a stone.³ The understanding of the stone of Is 28 in Qumran comes close to that of the original text.

A comparison of the use to which this text Is 28:16f has been put by Qumran and 1 Peter is quite instructive, as can be seen in the accompanying table. The whole context of 1QS VIII, 7f is one in which the community is described as the temple, and the scriptural warrant for such an identification is in the eyes of Qumran given by Is 28. The "trusting" of the Isaiah inscription is not mentioned, but the permanence and unconquerable position of the firmly established and divinely protected community is emphasized all the more. All three passages speak of a wall rather than a stone which is the foundation in Zion, but 1QH VI shows by its doublet what is meant: parallel to the strong wall are the tested stones (pl.). The word "wall" is used in order to bring out the collective aspect, for just as a foundation wall is made up of individual stones, so the community is made up of individual members. Also 4QpIs^d speaks of the members of the community as "stones". The usage of Qumran is consistent and represents one possible understanding of the Isaiah text.

When we turn to the text as quoted 1 Pet 2:6, we are immediately struck by the omission of any reference to a foundation, which is all the more remarkable because it is mentioned twice in the basic

nach dem Zusammenhang nicht an ein künftiges Königtum und ein neues Staatsgebilde gedacht, sondern an ein Gottesvolk in der Gottesstadt."

¹ O. Procksch, *Jesaiiah 1-39*, Leipzig, 1930, p. 358.

² *TWNT*, IV, 276f.

³ loc. cit. He cites Josephus as evidence for a Messianic interpretation of Dn 2:34ff but wrongly, as Josephus speaks as does Daniel of the kingdom of God.

Is 28:16f	1QS VIII, 7f	1QH VI, 26f	1QH VII, 8f	1 Pet 2:6
הנני		תשים סוד	תכן מבניתי	ἰδοὺ
יסד		על סלע	על סלע	(τιθημι)
בציון		אבני בחן	חומת בחן	ἐν Σιῶν
אבן בחן	חומת בחן	חומת עז		λίθον ἐκλεκτόν
פנת יקרת	פנת יקר		ואשי עלם לסודי	ἀποργωμάζον ἔντιμον
מוסד	יסודותיהו		לוא תודעו	(καὶ) ὁ πιστεύων (ἐπ' αὐτῷ) οὐ μὴ (κατασχευθῇ)
המאמדי לא יחיש	כל יידעוני וכל ידלוש	לוא תהווע בל ימוט		
ושמוני משפט לקו		וכפיס על קו משפט		
וצדקה למשקלת		ומשקלת אמת		

text and these are the only two omissions.¹ It would be then incorrect to say that 1 Pet 2 presents Jesus as the new temple. His interest in Is 28 seems to be confined to the inscription on the cornerstone, that he who believes in Jesus will not be put to shame. If Jesus is here identified with the cornerstone, then it is only for the sake of providing an antecedent for the ἐπ' αὐτῷ! That it is Jesus not as the temple but as the object of belief or disbelief which is important is shown by the immediately following citations of Ps 118:22 and 8:14. Very instructive is the parallel text Rm 9:33. This text agrees verbatim with the quotation in 1 Pet 2:6 with the exception that the words ἀκρογωνιαῖον ἐκλεκτον ἐντιμον have been lifted out and the words προσκύμματος καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου from Is 8:14 substituted for them. The agreement of these two texts must somehow be explained. Since it is not probable that one text is dependent on the other, we must think of a testimony collection² or an early Christian hymn³ or a common peshier tradition.⁴ In any case the primary scriptural reference seems to have been Ps 118:22, to which Is 8:14 was added, and then only later Is 28:16 included.⁵ Rm 9:33 makes no reference to the temple whatsoever, but then neither does 1 Pet 2:4-8 if we omit Vs 5. The text would then read: "Come to him, to the living stone, rejected by men but for God chosen and precious, for it stands in scripture, 'Behold I lay in Zion a cornerstone, chosen and precious, and he who believes in him will not be put to shame.' For you who believe then there is honor, but for the unbelievers 'the stone which the builders rejected has become the capstone' and 'a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense;' they stumble who disobey the word, for which purpose it was placed there." This passage of 1 Peter stands in a tradition in which Ps 118:22f has gradually collected other stone texts, first Is 8:14

¹ 1 Peter reads simply τῷθῃμι for the LXX ἐμβαλῶ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια. Lindars, *Apologetic*, p. 180, thinks that reference to the foundation has been omitted because the stone with the inscription must be above ground. But the same (rather precious) objection would apply to Is 28:16 itself, and the comment shows a lack of architectural understanding.

² R. Harris, *Testimonies*; C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, London, 1952, p. 43.

³ Selwyn, *1 Peter*, pp. 273-277.

⁴ Lindars, *Apologetic*.

⁵ Lindars says, *Apologetic*, p. 175, that "the use of Isa 28.16 (the precious corner stone) was probably always as a commentary on the other 'stone' passages." While this is definitely true of the Christological use of the passage, it remains to be seen if there is not also an ecclesiastical use.

and 28:16, then Dn 2:34 in Lk 20:18, and finally in Barnabas 6:2-4 all of these with the addition of Is 28:17; 50:7; Ps 118:24.¹ This whole tradition has nothing to do with the temple.

We return to the omitted 1 Pet 2:5 which does very much have to do with the temple: "you yourselves be built as living stones as a spiritual temple, to be a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ" (cf. also Vs 9). This is the verse to which Flusser was able to adduce so many parallels from Qumran. It seems that if the source for Vs 4, 6-8 was a pesher tradition having its beginning in Ps 118, the source for Vs 5 was the Qumran understanding in which the community is the temple. The assumption is that 1 Peter knew two interpretations of Is 28, one in which it was connected with the rejected stone of Ps 118 and the stumbling stone of Is 8, but also another in which it designated the community. In this latter image the "tested stone, the precious cornerstone of the foundation" would have been interpreted of the Christians as "living stones" which have been firmly established as the spiritual temple. 1 Peter was forced to speak also of Jesus as a living stone only because of the *Stichwort* association of Is 28 with Ps 118, but he has no thought of Jesus as the foundation of the temple. Thus the strange doubling of the stone Jesus and the living stones in 1 Pet 2:4-8 could be explained by this hypothesis. It remains however only an hypothesis until we can find some evidence of a communal interpretation of Is 28 in the early church.

We have already discussed at some length Eph 2:20ff and have seen that into an originally unified image of the new temple which Jesus builds on the foundation of the prophet-apostles has been inserted a statement that Jesus is the cornerstone of the building. Again we must disagree with Jeremias, who would see here a reference to the parousia with Jesus as the capstone, for the following reasons: 1. There is no mixture of growth and building images here so that Eph 4:15f, where Jesus is the head of the body, is irrelevant for the exegesis of Eph 2:20ff. 2. συναρμολογέω means simply "to join together" and in no sense implies "Zusammenfügen von oben her"² not even in Eph 4:16. 3. Although Is 28 is not cited, neither is Ps 118, and the word is the same as that which translates "corner-

¹ Cf. L. W. Barnard, "The Testimonium concerning the Stone in the New Testament and in the Epistle of Barnabas," *Studia Evangelica* III (TU 80), Berlin, 1964, pp. 306-313.

² *TWNT*, I, 793.

stone" in the former passage. 4. The post-Christian understanding of the word is not relevant because it presupposes a confusion with Ps 118, and such a confusion cannot be demonstrated for Eph 2. We conclude then along with E. Percy¹ that Eph 2:20 really calls Jesus the cornerstone, a most awkward conception. It is very probable that this was not part of the original image but has been added, perhaps in connection with the association made in 1 Pet 2:6.

All of our investigation so far has pointed in the direction of the earliest Palestinian church for the origin of the image of the New Testament congregation as the temple. The idea of Jesus as the temple or the foundation or the cornerstone has been seen to be secondary but to presuppose another image in which the congregation is the temple and the foundation and the cornerstone. Already the use of the image in Qumran would point toward a Palestinian environment as the place where the image entered the vocabulary of the church. We have seen that the temple image in Qumran is closely bound up with their understanding of Is 28, and we have supposed in connection with 1 Pet 2 that there was a similar understanding of this passage in the early church. The missing link then would be a New Testament passage which 1. clearly comes from the Palestinian church, 2. speaks of the congregation as the new temple and not Jesus, and 3. is based on an interpretation of Is 28. Such a passage exists in Mt 16:17-19.

- 17 Blessed are you, Simon Barjonah,
for flesh and blood have not revealed to you
but my Father who is in heaven.
- 18 And I tell you that you are Rock
and on this rock I will build my community,
and the gates of Sheol will not prevail against it.
- 19 I give you the keys of the kingdom of God,
and whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven
and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven.

This text meets all the criteria we have outlined. It is an isolated²

¹ *Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe*, Lund, 1946, pp. 399ff.

² Cf. O. Cullmann, "L'apôtre Pierre instrument du diable et instrument de Dieu," *New Testament Essays, Studies in Memory of T.W. Manson*, Manchester, 1959, pp. 94-105, who puts it in the context of Lk 22:31-34. If this is not sure, there is in any case no reason for supposing that the saying was ever part of an account of a resurrection appearance.

saying, whose Palestinian origin is not doubted by anyone.¹ Not only are there numerous Semitisms, but the whole concept behind the saying is understandable only on Palestinian ground. As this is not a disputed point we need not dwell on it.

Simon is given a new name, that of Rock (πέτρα). Since something is to be built on it the rock clearly functions as the foundation of a building. This building can only be the temple. This conclusion is given both from associations with the temple rock and from the relationship to Is 28. In the three Qumran passages we discussed, Is 28 was interpreted in terms of the community as the temple, which is firmly established on the rock. Twice the foundation is called a rock (סלע) and three times a wall (חומה). The main point of the comparison is seen in Isaiah's inscription: it will not yield (Qumran adds: nor tremble). Peter is called a rock (כיפא), that is foundation, because he is to be the firmly established base on which the community will be built. The saying in Isaiah is spoken against those who have made a covenant with Sheol and with death, for only the firmly established foundation, the believing community, will be able to withstand the coming flood (שטף). Similarly the author of 1QH VI, 24ff was saved by the firmly founded community, saved from the flood (תהום) when he was at the very gates of death (שערי מות). Also the firmly established community which Jesus founds on the rock will be able to withstand the gates of death, the gates of Sheol.² While the second strophe of the saying is in no sense a citation and thus does not come from the scriptural reflection of the early church,³ it reflects exactly Is 28:16 as this text was understood in Qumran.⁴

¹ Cf. R. Bultmann, *syn. Trad.*, pp. 147-151, and *Ergänzungsheft*, pp. 21f.

² The terms are synonymous and come from Old Testament usage; cf. Is 38:10 (gates of Sheol) and Job 38:17; Ps 9:14; 107:18 (gates of death). Cf. also Sap. Sol. 16:13; Ps. Sol. 16:2.

³ Lindars, *Apologetic*, pp. 181-183, points out that Peter is called a *σάνδαλον* in Mt 16:23, which he takes to prove that the stone testimony Is 8:14 is being used. On this basis he argues against the genuineness of the passage. But we would have to object 1. that Mt 16:23 is irrelevant to the interpretation of the originally isolated 16:17-19, and 2. there is no Christological stone testimony present here at all, so that the passage could have no connection with the later stone theology.

⁴ That Mt 16:18 is to be interpreted against the background of Is 28:16, cf. O. Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte*, Tübingen, 1960, pp. 158-163; and for the Qumran background, cf. his very important article: "Felsenmann und Felsengemeinde (Eine Parallele zu Mt 16, 17-19 in den Qumranpsalmen)," *ZNW* 48 (1957), 49-77.

At the same time, Mt 16:18 reflects the connotations associated with the temple rock in Jerusalem. The great importance of this conception has been emphasized repeatedly by J. Jeremias.¹ The bare rock on which the temple was built inherited all of the conceptions of the Canaanite mythical mountain of the gods. This rock, the **אבן שתייה**, is not only the foundation of the temple, but as the navel of the earth it is the foundation of the whole world. Only this rock is firmly established enough to be able to withstand the floods of the deep, the powers of death and Sheol. We have already referred to the conception that the stream of living water will flow from this rock and therefore its importance in the water ceremonies of Tabernacles. It is in its aspect of firmness and of serving as a foundation for the temple that the image of the foundation rock is here applied to Simon, who thereby becomes the foundation of the community Jesus will build. As the rock is the foundation of the temple, so Simon Rock is the foundation of the community, just as Abraham is the foundation of Israel. This image is actually found Is 51:1f, where "Abraham your father" is parallel to "the rock from which you were hewn."² The Rabbinic understanding of this passage is in terms of the foundation stone,³ but it is interesting to see that the founders can also be the twelve patriarchs⁴ or the whole community of Israel.⁵ Thus, although there is no suggestion in Qumran that only one person would make up the foundation, the concept is known in Judaism otherwise, and there is no real contradiction between Mt 16:18, where Simon Rock is the foundation, and Eph 2:20; Rev 21:14, where the foundation is made up of the Twelve.

Also the third stanza is in accordance with the Qumran conception of the community as the temple. Already the idea that the kingdom of God has keys presupposes the image of a building, to which people can be admitted or excluded. The image of the keys implies that the binding and loosing are to be interpreted not in terms of the Rabbinic **אסר** and **שרא**, to forbid or permit certain actions by

¹ First in *Golgotha*, 1926.

² Cf. J. M. Ford, "Thou Art 'Abraham' and Upon This Rock . . .," *Heythrop Journ.* 6 (1965), 289-301.

³ Yalqut 1, § 766, cited in Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, I, p. 733.

⁴ Ex. Rab. 15:8, cited in Jeremias, *Golgotha*, p. 74.

⁵ "Abraham, bzw. die Gemeinde ist das Fundament, auf dem sich der Felsenbau der Welt erhebt, der 'Boden' der Welt, der die Existenz der Welt rechtfertigt," Vielhauer, *Oikodome*, p. 18.

interpretation of the law,¹ but rather of admission or exclusion from the kingdom. Examples of such decisions are to be found Acts 5: 1-11; 1 Cor 5: 1-5; and Mt 18: 15-18, the latter passage containing the same phrase about binding and loosing. The image of the temple at Qumran also implies exclusion; cf. 4QFlor I, 4, "the house into which shall not enter forever an Ammonite or a Moabite or a bastard or a foreigner or a stranger;" 1QH VI, 27f, "a stranger will not go into its gates." We also hear about admission into the congregation 1QS VI, 21-23 (cf. V, 3; and CD XIII, 13, where the overseer makes the decision). This must be the sense of the power of the keys in Mt 16: 19, and it may be that there is an Old Testament text which justifies this interpretation. Is 22: 22 speaks of Eliakim, on whose shoulders God places "the key of the house of David; he shall open (Heb., Aram. פתח) and none shall shut; and he shall shut (Heb. סגר Aram. אחר) and none shall open."² J. A. Emerton³ suggests that only this text can account for both Mt 16: 19 (18: 18) and Jn 20: 23, "whosoever sins you forgive, they are forgiven them, and whosoever you retain, they are retained." פתח, to open, set free, could easily account for both the λύω of Matthew⁴ and the ἀφίημι of John, while אחר, to close, seize, would explain the strange κρατέω of John and could conceivably be translated by δέω in Matthew. Whether or not we are again to assume the use of an Isaiah text, Mt 16: 19 too is evidence of an understanding of the community as the temple similar to that of Qumran.

We have now demonstrated that there is a text which shows decisively that the Palestinean church interpreted Is 28 in a manner similar to that of Qumran, in which the image of the temple is interpreted of the community and not Christologically at all.⁵

¹ So Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, I, p. 739; Bultmann, *syn. Trad.*, p. 148; Büchsel, *TWNT*, II, 59f; Jeremias, *TWNT*, III, 743-753. To be sure, they agree that the sense of the phrase must be "den Bann verhängen und aufheben" (Jeremias, p. 751), but this meaning is very infrequent in connection with the verbs אסר and שרר.

² That this text is known in the New Testament, cf. Rev 1: 18; 3: 7. It seems not to have been cited in the Qumran texts published to date.

³ "Binding and Loosing — Forgiving and Retaining," *JThSt* 13 (1962), 325-331.

⁴ λύω translates פתח frequently in the LXX; in the sense of forgiveness Is 40: 2; Job 42: 9; cf. Sir 28: 2.

⁵ V. Burch, "The 'Stone' and the 'Keys' (Mt 16: 18ff)," *JBL* 52 (1933), 147-152, p. 150, stands all alone in his strange exposition that the Rock is Jesus and Simon is named bar-Kepha. O. J. F. Seitz, "Upon this Rock: A Critical Re-examination of Math. 16: 17-19," *JBL* 69 (1950), 329-340,

Jesus is seen here not as the new temple himself or as part of the building, but as the one who builds: "on this rock I will build my community." It should be immediately obvious¹ that this is a very close parallel to the second half of the saying Mk 14:58, 'I will build another (temple) which is not made with hands.' Here are two sayings in which Jesus appears as the builder of the congregation = temple. There can be no question but that this represents an older usage than 1 Cor 3:10f, in which Paul designates himself as the "wise master-builder" who "laid the foundation. . . which is Jesus Christ." While in Qumran the righteous teacher (4QpPs 37, III, 15f) or the community (4Qflor I, 6) can be said to build the temple community, it is only God who lays the foundation (CD III, 19 and the three passages dependent on Is 28). If the Palestinian church sees itself as the new temple then, it sees Jesus as the one who builds this temple, on the foundation of Peter and the Twelve.

The question of the genuineness of Mt 16:17-19 is very much disputed and can be decided only in connection with broader issues concerning the church and the kingdom of God in the teaching of Jesus.² For the present we can say that we would have to agree with the criticisms of Bultmann and Kümmel³ if the word ἐκκλησία is to be interpreted as a כְּנִישָׁתָא, a "Sondersynagoge". We have seen however that the word must be interpreted rather of the community as the temple, the עֲדָה of 4QpPs 37 III, 16, and thus the question of genuineness must be reopened. While a final decision must await our discussion of the kingdom of God, we can provisionally affirm along with many scholars⁴ that Mt 16:17-19 could have been said by Jesus in something very like its present form.

is so disturbed by the fact that Peter should be called the rock instead of Jesus, in seeming contradiction to the other New Testament stone passages, that he assumes Mt 16:17-19 to be an interpolation nearly contemporary with Irenaeus and Tertullian (p. 334). These two desperate attempts show how hard it is to maintain the priority of the concept of Jesus as the rock.

¹ It should be but it evidently has not always been so. Cullmann, *Petrus*, p. 223f, who points out the importance of the parallel, says: "Wenn es in den Diskussionen über unsere Frage eine so geringe Rolle spielt, so kommt dies nur daher, weil man sich durch die Wortstatistik (ἐκκλησία only twice in the Synoptics) verleiten lässt, nicht mehr auf die Sache zu achten."

² Cf. the reports of Bultmann, "Die Frage nach der Echtheit von Mt. 16, 17-19," *ThBl* 20 (1941), Sp 265-279; Oepke, "Der Herrnspruch über die Kirche Mt 16, 17-19 in der neuesten Forschung," *StudTheol* 2 (1950), 110-165; Cullmann, *Petrus, Jünger-Apostel-Märtyrer*, Zürich, 1952, pp. 176-190.

³ Bultmann, op. cit.; W. G. Kümmel, "Jesus und die Anfänge der Kirche," *StudTheol* 7 (1953), 1-27, p. 16.

⁴ Jeremias, *Golgotha*, p. 68; Oepke, "Herrnspruch"; Cullmann, *Petrus*.

We hope to have shown that of the two usages of the image of the temple in the New Testament, that which applies the image to Jesus and that which applies it to the community, the latter is prior from the standpoint of the history of tradition. There is a continuity of image when we pass from the theology of Qumran to that of the Jewish-Christian church. On the other hand, the so-called stone Christology was seen to have its roots not in the image of the temple at all but in the use of Ps 118:22 in the passion apologetic of the early church, and the application to Jesus of Is 28:16 was seen to be a later development. Where the two images are combined, as in some of the epistle passages, the designation of Jesus as the temple was seen to be a later development than the designation of the congregation as the temple. Where Jesus alone is the temple, as in the Fourth Gospel, this can be understood as a reasonable development from the concept of the community as the temple when this is combined with the Christology of the early church. On the other hand, the opposite development, the transition of the image from Jesus to the church, would be harder to understand. Nevertheless this is the development which Gärtner concludes took place. "In the Gospels . . . , Jesus is the temple; it is through him that a new fellowship with God is established. There is no suggestion that his disciples or his followers constitute a 'new temple'. In Qumran the temple was replaced by the community; in the New Testament by Jesus himself. . . . The temple symbolism in the New Testament epistles. . . (was) brought into the church by former members of the Qumran sect or other Essene groups. . . (and) received new meaning from the faith and the teachings based on Christ. That is why the idea of the community as the spiritual temple appears in forms reminiscent, both in outline and detail, of the Qumran texts."¹ In view of the extensive correspondences between Qumran and the New Testament epistles, this latter statement can be readily conceded. We would have to say, however, that Gärtner has not proved the case that in the gospels Jesus is the temple, for in the texts we examined in part I above we came to quite different conclusions. Why then should the Qumran conception have been so easily adopted by the early church if there was nothing analogous in the teaching of Jesus? The concluding section

N. A. Dahl, *Das Volk Gottes*, Oslo, 1941, p. 165, is cautious but tends in this direction.

¹ *Temple*, pp. 137, 139.

will examine the question whether or not Jesus too spoke of the community as the temple.

E. The Community as the Temple in the Teaching of Jesus

So far we hope to have demonstrated that in the history of tradition the concept of the community as the temple goes back to the earliest church. When Jesus is said to be the temple, this is a later development of the image based on the passion apologetic which calls Jesus the rejected stone of Ps 118:22 and on the developing doctrine of the incarnation. There is a direct line which leads from Qumran through the Jerusalem church to the later epistles according to which it is the community which is the temple and not Jesus. In view of the general tendency of the church to apply to the person of Jesus what Jesus had said of his mission, it may be that the line goes through Jesus himself. This is the question to which we now address ourselves: when the earliest church spoke of the community as the temple, since there must be some contact with the similar Qumran image, was the influence directly from Qumran to the church, or was it mediated and reinforced through the teaching of Jesus?

Although it is often difficult to distinguish the teaching of Jesus from that of the church, there is today a consensus which would put the concept of the kingdom of God at the center of Jesus' teaching. This consensus, whose growth has been admirably documented by N. Perrin,¹ includes the following basic concepts. First, the term βασιλεία - מלכות is to be translated as "reign" and not "realm". Second, it is an eschatological concept, roughly equivalent to the "age to come". Third, since both a consistent and a realized eschatology have been seen to represent extreme positions, the kingdom of God refers to both a future and a present reality. It will be our contention that those aspects of the kingdom of God in the teaching of Jesus which have been neglected by the modern consensus point to an understanding of the community as the temple.

The modern discussion of the kingdom of God has centered around the reconciliation of two sets of synoptic sayings: those which speak of it as a future event and those which imply that this event has somehow come with Jesus. There is however a third group of sayings which speak of "entering" the kingdom of God,

¹ *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus*, London, 1963.

sayings which because they seem to speak of the kingdom as a realm after all have been largely ignored as irrelevant. These sayings were discussed in an important article by H. Windisch,¹ the implications of which have not yet been fully explored. Windisch pointed out how the gospel sayings concerning entering the kingdom of God correspond to the form-critical category Mowinckel called "*thôrôth d'entrée*".² Ps 15 and 24 are good examples of this liturgy, in which the procession of worshippers ask who may enter the temple, the priests answer with a series of commandments, which then the worshippers confess that they have kept. Research has tended to concentrate on the aspect of the commandments, Mowinckel pointing out the connection with the decalogue, von Rad³ finding the form in Dt 26:13ff; Ezek 18:5-7; and Job 21, and Windisch applying it to the Sermon on the Mount. More interesting for us is the fact that the liturgy deals with entry into the temple.⁴ Already in the Old Testament this aspect can be generalized, as when Dt 4:1; 6:17f speak of qualifications for entry into the promised land. Especially interesting is the connection with the Zion tradition in Isaiah, which seems to be interpreted figuratively in terms of the faith of the firmly established community. "We have a strong city: he sets up salvation as walls and bulwarks. Open, ye gates, that the righteous nation which keeps faith may enter in. The steadfast mind thou keepest in peace, for he trusts in thee. Trust in Yahweh forever, for Yahweh is an everlasting rock" (Is 26:1-4). After the question, "who can dwell with consuming fire?" and the answer, "he who walks righteously", etc., the promise is given: "he will dwell on the heights, his stronghold will be citadels of rock" (Is 33:14-16). Insofar then as the form of the *thôrôth d'entrée* is used, it includes the conception of entering into the temple.

The conclusion on the basis of the sayings concerning entering the kingdom that the kingdom of God is equivalent to the temple was drawn with all its consequences only by E. Lohmeyer.⁵ He says

¹ "Die Sprüche vom Eingehen in das Reich Gottes," *ZNW* 27 (1928), 163-192.

² *Le Décalogue*, Paris, 1927, pp. 141ff.

³ "'Gerechtigkeit' und 'Leben' in der Kultsprache der Psalmen," *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, München, 1958, pp. 225-247.

⁴ Cf. the version of this Gattung in terms of requirements for entry into the Qumran community, 1QS I, 16; V, 7ff, 20ff; VI, 13ff; etc.

⁵ *Kultus und Evangelium*, Göttingen, 1942, pp. 72f; *Das Vater-Unser*, Göttingen, 1960⁴, pp. 64-68; quotation p. 65.

concerning this aspect of the kingdom of God, "Dieses eschatologische 'Vaterhaus' (Joh 14,2) hat sein deutliches geschichtliches Gegenbild in dem Gotteshaus, das jetzt zu Jerusalem die Wohnstätte Gottes und die unerschütterliche und heilige Mitte der Gemeinschaft aller jüdischen Frommen ist." Unfortunately his insights have been largely ignored in subsequent discussions of the kingdom.¹

In a very important article, S. Aalen² questions whether the translation "reign of God" is after all correct. He points out that God is usually called "father" in the gospels not "king", and that it is not said that God "rules" but that he gives the kingship, to Jesus and his followers.³ Further, whereas the kingship of God can in Judaism be something which is "revealed" at the end of the age, the kingdom in the New Testament is not revealed but "comes". It therefore is not so much the designation of an activity of God as it is a realm of salvation for men which God will bring. As something which is prepared and will come, it is parallel to the conception of the *'Olam ha-ba*, or even more to the concept of the eschatological Jerusalem. Aalen says that the kingdom is not a theophany but something which comes into history, as the prophets and kings, John the Baptist and Jesus "came". However, since the kingdom is also the goal of history it is perhaps best not to make this distinction between historical and eschatological. While Aalen points to the connection already in the Old Testament of house and kingdom (especially in 1 Chr 17:7-14) as representing the people of God, we are interested specifically in the idea that this house is the temple.

The synoptic⁴ sayings concerning entry into the kingdom of God can be listed as follows:

¹ Thus W. G. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfillment*, London, 1957, p. 52f, speaks of the entry sayings only in terms of their referring to the future.

² "'Reign' and 'House' in the Kingdom of God in the Gospels," *NTS* 8 (1962), 215-240. Significantly, Aalen is never even mentioned in Perrin, *Kingdom*.

³ E.g. Lk 12:32; 22:29; Mt 21:43. In Dn 7:14 the kingdom is given to the Son of Man, a concept exceedingly important in understanding the teaching of Jesus; cf. below, pp. 393-409.

⁴ For the later history of this form in the Apostolic Fathers, cf. Windisch, "Sprüche," pp. 189ff; and cf. also Logion 22 of the Gospel of Thomas: "Jesus saw children that were being suckled. He said to his disciples: These children being suckled are like those who enter the kingdom. They said to him, If we are children, shall we enter the kingdom? Jesus said to them:

And if your hand gives you offense, cut it off, for it is better to *enter life* crippled than having two hands to go down into Gehenna, to the unquenchable fire. And if your foot gives you offense, cut it off, for it is better to *enter life* lame than having two feet to be thrown into Gehenna. And if your eye gives you offense, pluck it out, for it is better to *enter the kingdom of God* one-eyed than having two eyes to be thrown into Gehenna. (Mk 9:43-48, par Mt 18:8-9, but reading "life" in the last example)

Amen I say to you, whoever does not receive the kingdom of God as a child, will not *enter* it. (Mk 10:15, par Lk 18:17)

With how much difficulty will those who have riches *enter* the kingdom of God . . . Children, how difficult it is to *enter* the kingdom of God. It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to *enter* the kingdom of God. (Mk 10:23-25, par Mt 19:23f; Lk 18:24f)

For I tell you that if your righteousness does not exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees, you will not *enter* the kingdom of heaven. (Mt 5:20)

Not everyone who says to me, 'Lord, Lord,' will *enter* the kingdom of heaven. (Mt 7:12)

Amen I say to you, unless you turn and become like children, you will not *enter* the kingdom of heaven. (Mt 18:3)

Amen I say to you that the tax-collectors and prostitutes will *precede* you into the kingdom of God. (Mt 21:31)

Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you lock the kingdom of heaven in the face of men; for you do not *go in*, neither do you allow those waiting to *enter* to *go in*. (Mt 23:13)

I tell you that many from the east and the west will *come* and sit at table with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven. But the sons of the kingdom will be thrown out into the outer darkness. (Q, Mt 8:11f = Lk 13:28f)

The kingdom of heaven is *forced* and men of violence seize it. (Mt 11:12b).

The kingdom of God is preached, and everyone *forces his way* into it. (Lk 16:16b)

When you make the two one, and make the inside like the outside, and the outside like the inside, and the upper side like the under side, and when you make the male and female into a single one, so that the male will not be male and the female will not be female; when you make eyes in place of an eye, and a hand in place of a hand, and a foot in place of a foot, an image in place of an image, then you shall enter the kingdom." (Trans. B. M. Metzger).

Cf:

Amen, amen, I say to you, unless one is born from water and the Spirit he cannot *enter* the kingdom of God. (Jn 3:5)

Through many tribulations we must *enter* the kingdom of God. (Acts 14: 22)

These sayings come from so many different strands of the gospel tradition that there can be no question of the genuineness of the expression. Although it can be said that the entering of the kingdom is a future action, the main point of most of the sayings is not temporal-eschatological at all but concerns the conditions for entry. The sayings are not apocalyptic but ethical wisdom logia, and the image is not temporal but spatial. These sayings all concern entering the kingdom of God, but it is not really different when other sayings speak of being *in* (Mk 14:25; Lk 7:28 = Mt 11:11; Mt 15:19; 13:43; 18:4; Lk 22:16, 30) or *out* of (Mk 4:11; Mt 8:12; 13:41; 22:13; 25:10; Lk 13:25) the kingdom, just as one can be *near* it (Mk 12:34, perhaps Lk 17:21).¹ In Mk 9:43-48 we find that entering the kingdom is parallel to entering life. We therefore should include among the *thôrôth d'entrée* such sayings as Mt 19:17, "If you wish to enter life, keep the commandments" (cf. Mt 25:46), as well as Mt 25:21, 23, "enter into joy", and perhaps Lk 24:26, "enter into glory". In view of the liturgical affinities of the question, "What must I do to inherit eternal life" (Mk 10:17; Lk 10:25), and the connection of Israel's inheritance with entering the land of Canaan, we should probably also include the concept of "inheriting the kingdom" here (Mt 25:34; cf. 1 Cor 6:9f; 15:50; Gal 5:21; Eph 5:5; James 2:5). Definitely spatial if strictly eschatological are such sayings as Jn 14:2, "in the house of my father are many rooms," and Lk 16:9, which speaks of being received into the "eschatological tabernacles".² This long list of passages shows that we are dealing with no mere special usage. Discussion of the concept kingdom of God in the synoptic gospels has previously centred on those sayings which say that the kingdom will come / has come. Perhaps even more inclusive are the sayings which explicitly or implicitly speak of entering the kingdom.

¹ Cf. the apocryphal saying of Jesus: "he that is near me is near the fire; he that is far from me is far from the kingdom (v.l. life)." Cf. J. Jeremias, *Unknown Sayings of Jesus*, London, 1958, pp. 54-56.

² So Michaelis, *TWNT*, VII, 379f.

That the sayings concerning entering the kingdom are no mere metaphor but represent a definite image can be shown by a number of more specific passages. First, the kingdom of God has a door or gate through which one enters. "Try to enter through the narrow door (θύρα), for many, I tell you, will seek to enter and not be able" (Lk 13:24). The fuller parallel in Mt 7:13f characterizes the narrow gate (πύλη) and the hard way as the one "which leads to life", and it is seen that the saying is a version of the widespread two-way schema. It is for this reason that the Lucan version, which speaks only of one door and not at all of the way, is apt to be more original.¹ Other sayings using the same image have been included in the Lucan context. "After the master of the house has risen and locked the door you will begin to stand outside and to knock on the door" (Lk 13:25), but they will not be admitted. Instead they will be thrust out, while they see Abraham and Isaac and Jacob inside, and other men "sitting at table (with them) in the kingdom of God" (Lk 13:29). More promising but the same image is Lk 11:9f (Mt 7:7f), "knock, and it will be opened for you . . . for to him who knocks it will be opened" (cf. Rev 3:8). A rather special usage identifies Jesus with this door. Most interesting is the rather confused statement made by Hegesippus that the people asked James the Just "what was the gate of Jesus, and he replied that he was the savior."² When we consider also that in the pseudo-Clementines Jesus says that he is the gate of life (Hom 3, 52), there seems to have been a specifically Jewish-Christian tradition which identified Jesus with the door. The source is probably the application to Jesus by the early church of Ps 118:20, "This is the gate of the Lord; the righteous shall enter through it" (so explicitly 1 Clem 48:3; cf. Ignatius, Phil 9:1). A connection with the temple is made in the complex image of Hermas, who in addition to making Jesus a) the foundation stone of the temple and b) the builder of the temple, also says that he is c) the gate of the temple (Sim 9, 12, 1).³ However, it appears that

¹ Cf. Jeremias, *TWNT*, III, 178. He says, "Konkret gedacht ist an den Zugang zum endzeitlichen Palast Gottes . . . nicht zum künftigen Jerusalem." Why not say "temple" instead of "palace"?

² Eusebius, H.E. II, xxiii, 8. Cf. Vs 12f where James replies to the question "what is the gate of Jesus?" by saying "why do you ask me concerning the Son of Man?"

³ The connection with the temple is complete in the Gospel of the Naassenes cited by Hippolytus, *Ref.* V, 8, 20 (Hennecke, *Apokryphen*, I, p. 201): "He (Jacob) admired the gates of heaven and called out: 'how awe-

the image did not begin from an identification of Jesus with part of the temple, and therefore we did not discuss Jn 10:7, 9 in this connection. This saying, "I am the door; whoever enters through me will be saved", was taken up by John (in connection with a parable of a sheepfold not the temple) from the earlier usage which said Jesus is the door. While probably not a saying of Jesus, this too may perhaps be cited as evidence that he did speak of the necessity of entering through a door in connection with the kingdom of God.

The kingdom has not only a door through which to enter, but this door also has keys. If Mt 23:13 says that the scribes and Pharisees "lock (the door of) the kingdom of heaven in the face of men", the Lucan parallel Lk 11:52 says that they "take away the keys of knowledge." Knowledge, viz, of the will of God expressed in the Torah, is here seen as the key to the door of the kingdom of God,¹ a knowledge which the Pharisees keep from the people by "making void the word of God through their tradition" (Mk 7:13). These keys are really no different from the "keys of the kingdom of heaven" which in Mt 16:19 are definitely part of the image of the community as the temple, as we have seen. Thus the keys of Lk 11:52 and Mt 16:19 provide an important link in showing the equivalence of entering the kingdom of God, entering the new temple, and entering the Christian congregation.

The saying Mt 11:12 = Lk 16:16 is a notoriously difficult one. There is no necessity to try to suggest an exegesis of it here beyond the observation that both versions presuppose an image of the kingdom of God as a house which can be stormed. Recognition of the fact that this house is the temple which stands under divine protection can then help in the exposition: the two verbs ἀρπάζουσιν and βιάζεται must be presents *de conatu*,² for even though some may try to rob men of the kingdom,³ just as they try to keep men from entering (Mt 23:13), they will not succeed. Another storming of a house, however, has succeeded. Just as God has a house and a kingdom so Satan has a house and a kingdom (Lk 11:17f par). "If a kingdom is divided against itself, that kingdom cannot stand, and if a house is divided against itself, that house will

some is this place. This is none other than the house of God and this is the gate of heaven.' Therefore Jesus said, 'I am the true gate.' "

¹ Cf. Jeremias, *TWNT*, III, 746f.

² Blass-Debrunner, § 319.

³ So G. Schrenk, *TWNT*, I, 610.

not be able to stand" (Mk 3:24f). And in fact, Satan's house and kingdom have not stood, because it has been successfully stormed by Jesus, as his exorcisms show: "No one can enter the house of the strong man and rob (διαρπάσαι) his goods, unless he first bind the strong man, and then he will rob his house" (Mk 3:27). Also these negative aspects show then that the basic image of the kingdom of God is as a house, a realm not a reign.

It is significant that the image of Satan's house which Jesus has stormed should be connected with the accusation of being possessed by Beelzebul. I have tried elsewhere¹ to show that this word must mean "Lord of the dwelling", and yet at the same time be a name of Satan coined for this occasion. The word זבול in the Old Testament, the Qumran scrolls, and the Rabbinic literature is used for heaven or the temple, both in the sense of God's dwelling place. The opponents of Jesus think of the heavenly Zeus, Baalshamaim, as the chief of the demons, and Beelzebul cacophemistically refers to the name. The name Beelzebul = Baalshamaim = Satan is transparent enough to be readily understood by Jesus, and at the same time it throws in his face his claim to be "Lord of the temple". The word זבול never means dwelling in general, but it always refers specifically to heaven or the temple. Since Jesus would hardly have claimed to be Lord of heaven, in either a good or bad sense, the very use of the name is evidence that he did claim to be Lord of the (new) temple. Confirmation is provided by the isolated² saying Mt 10:25b, "If they have called the master of the house Beelzebul, how much more shall they call those of his household so." As the word Beelzebul shows, this house of which Jesus here very positively claims to be the master can only be the temple as a figure for "those of his household". This was not for Jesus an isolated manner of speaking but so characteristic for him that it could even provide a taunt for his enemies. It is the same taunt which appears in the mouth of the mockers under the cross: "you who destroy and build in three days the temple" (Mk 15:29).

It is not legitimate to interpret the parables as allegories. Nevertheless, when a great many of them are couched in terms of a common situation and this is one which is not common in the literature otherwise, then perhaps this situation does indicate something about Jesus' teaching. If the Rabbis liked to tell parables in terms

¹ "Beelzebul," *ThZ* 18 (1962), 247-255.

² Cf. Bultmann, *syn. Trad.*, p. 94.

of a king, in the synoptic gospels the most common figure is the householder. It is astounding how many such parables there are: the absent householder (Lk 12:42-46=Mt 24:45-51), the householder and the unjust steward (Lk 16:1-8), the householder and the servants' duty (Lk 17:7-10), the householder and the workers in the vineyard (Mt 20:1-15), the householder with two sons (Mt 21:28-31), the householder whose friend begs at midnight when the door is shut (Lk 11:5-8), the householder who went away entrusting his property to his servants (the talents, Mt 25:14-30). In the last mentioned the servants are judged by being "cast into the outer darkness" or are told to "enter into the joy of your master." The parable of the tenants Mk 12:1-12 par is somewhat similar and is surely intended as an allegory: the vineyard is Israel, the tower is the temple, and the tenants are therefore the temple authorities.¹ When the care of the vineyard is taken from them and given to others (the church), Mt 21:43 says that the kingdom of God is taken from them. This is interesting in that the kingdom of God (a vineyard here rather than a house) is equivalent to a community (Israel). To return however to the householder, there are no less than six parables in which the activity in the house is a banquet. Thus there is the marriage banquet (Mt 22:1-10=Lk 14:16-24), which in the Lucan version contains the interesting command: "go out to the highways and hedges and compel people to enter, that my house may be filled." Mt 22:11-13 tells of the guest with no wedding garment who is therefore "cast into the outer darkness." The five foolish virgins (Mt 25:1-12) came to the wedding banquet too late, so that "the door was shut." The father celebrates the return of the prodigal son (Lk 15:11-32) by giving a banquet, eating and making merry. There is the parable of the places of honor at a banquet (Lk 14:7-10). And finally there is the parable of the absent householder (Lk 12:36-38) who when he returns "will gird himself and have them sit at table and he will come and serve them." The picture presented by all of these parables is a consistent one. There is a house, which has a door which can be locked. Inside the house there is a banquet, often a marriage banquet, at which there is great rejoicing. The hearers are exhorted to be among those on the inside and not to be cast out, not to find the door shut and locked, for outside there is darkness and no joy.

¹ Cf. E. Lohmeyer, "Das Gleichnis von den bösen Weingärtnern (Mark. 12, 1-12)," *Urchristliche Mystik*, Darmstadt, 1956, pp. 161-181.

The picture of the banquet in the house which we find in so many parables is also to be found in non-parabolic sayings of Jesus. The most important is Mt 8:11 par, "I tell you that many from the east and the west will come and sit at table with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven." Here is not only the image of the banquet in the kingdom of God but also of the eschatological pilgrimage of the Gentiles to Mt. Zion. The concepts of the new temple and of salvation for the Gentiles are related.¹ There are other sayings, such as Lk 14:15, "blessed is he who shall eat bread in the kingdom of God" (cf. Rev 19:9, "blessed are those who are invited to the marriage supper of the Lamb") and Mk 2:19, "can the wedding guests fast while the bridegroom is with them?" The meals Jesus ate with tax-collectors and sinners take on new significance, as is shown by the statement Mk 2:17, "I came to invite (to the banquet) not the righteous but sinners." The feeding of the multitude is seen as an anticipation of the eschatological banquet, as are other meals Jesus ate with his followers. Jesus gives his disciples the promise that "you shall eat and drink at my table in my kingdom" (Lk 22:30). Very important in this connection is Jesus' vow at the last supper, "Amen I say to you, I shall not drink again of the fruit of the vine until I drink it new in the kingdom of God" (Mk 14:25). The concept of the new temple is connected not only with the kingdom of God but also with the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

It is very probable that not only the Lord's Supper but also baptism are to be seen against the background of what we have called above "democratization of the cult."² Like their contemporaries at Qumran and among the Pharisees, Jesus and his followers too were attempting to realize the old covenant promise that Israel should be "a kingdom of priests, a holy nation" (1 Pet 2:9, citing Ex 19:6). Like the *haburoth* of the Pharisees and the sacred meal of the Essenes, so the Lord's Supper of the church represents both an anticipation of the eschatological banquet in the new temple and a democratization of the actual meals eaten by the priests in the Jerusalem temple.³ As for baptism, "the whole complex cere-

¹ Cf. J. Jeremias, *Jesus' Promise for the Nations*, London, 1958, pp. 65ff; and below, pp. 428-433.

² Cf. above, p. 131.

³ On the connection of the Qumran sacred meal with the priestly meals of the Jerusalem temple, cf. J. Gnllka, "Das Gemeinschaftsmahl der Essener," *BZ* 5 (1961), 39-55.

mony of Christian initiation, including water-baptism, change of clothes, anointing and first communion, corresponds to the pattern of the Old Testament initiation of priests."¹ As the priests bathed before entering the temple, so the people had to bathe before entering the new temple, the kingdom of God.² It is perhaps significant that the two most explicit temple passages are found in epistles closely related to baptismal catechesis: 1 Peter³ and Ephesians,⁴ which has led W. Nauck⁵ to speak of the connection between temple and forgiveness of sins in the liturgy of baptism. A. Isaksson⁶ has plausibly argued that the prohibition of divorce except in the case of unchastity (Mt 19:9) is due to the application to the community as the new temple of regulations originally applying only to the priests (Ezek 44:22). A.A.T. Ehrhardt⁷ has shown how the ministry of the Jerusalem church, even in detail, was dependent on the Old Testament provisions concerning the priests. In a very important article C.F.D. Moule⁸ has shown how widespread in the catechesis of the early church are the motifs of new temple and

¹ N. A. Dahl, "The Origin of Baptism," *Norsk Teol. Tidssk.* 56 (1955), 36-52, p. 46.

² Cf. Dahl, "Baptism," p. 44, and J. Jeremias, "Der Gedanke des 'Heiligen Restes' im Spätjudentum und in der Verkündigung Jesu," *ZNW* 42 (1949), 184-194.

³ Cf. W. Bornemann, "Der erste Petrusbrief — eine Taufrede des Silvanus?," *ZNW* 19 (1920), 143-165; F. L. Cross, 1 *Peter: A Paschal Liturgy*, London, 1954; W. Nauck, "Freude im Leiden; Zum Problem einer urchristlichen Verfolgungstradition," *ZNW* 46 (1955), 68-80; F. W. Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter*, Oxford, 1958².

⁴ Cf. H. Sahlin, *Die Beschneidung Christi*, Uppsala, 1950; N. A. Dahl, "Adresse und Prooemium des Epheserbriefs," *ThZ* 7 (1951), 241-264.

⁵ *Die Tradition und der Charakter des ersten Johannesbriefs*, Tübingen, 1957, p. 48.

⁶ *Marriage and Ministry in the New Temple*, Lund, 1965, The gospels would repay further study along the lines Isaksson has suggested. For example, even the commandment to the missionaries Mt 10:10, that they should travel without bag, sandals, or staff, may be explainable on this basis. "Wahrscheinlich sind unsere Jesus-Worte aus einer gottesdienstlichen Bestimmung zu verstehen: 'Niemand betrete den Tempelberg mit Stab, Schublen, Geldbeutel oder staubigen Füßen,'" J. Schniewind, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (NTD 2), Göttingen, 1954⁷, p. 129. The reference is to the Mishnah, Ber 9:5.

⁷ *The Apostolic Succession*, London, 1953. It is perhaps in this connection that we are to understand the strange tradition that John (Eusebius, H.E. III, xxxi, 3; V, xxiv, 3) and James (Epiphanius, Haer. 29, 4; 78, 14) wore the πέταλον of the high priest.

⁸ "Sanctuary and Sacrifice in the Church of the New Testament," *JTS* 1 (1950), 29-41. He points out p. 31 how these two motifs are combined in the concept of the "body of Christ".

spiritual sacrifice. All of these studies only point out the great importance of the pioneering but sadly neglected work of E. Lohmeyer, *Kultus und Evangelium*.¹

We return then in this final section to the starting point of the first part of this chapter: the attitude of Jesus and the early church to the cult of the Jerusalem temple. We assumed there a profound indifference to cultic matters on the part of Jesus, an indifference which called forth the opposition which the controversy stories of the church were meant to counter. We see now the reason for this indifference: all of the functions of the Jerusalem temple were in fact fulfilled for Jesus in the new temple which he had come to found. It is important to emphasize that for Jesus it is the community which is the new temple and not himself. It is the community in which the Shekinah dwells, when Jesus says Mt 18:20 that "where two or three are gathered in my name, there I am in the midst of them" (cf. 28:20). To be sure, it is the risen Jesus who dwells as the Shekinah, and so the development of John in which the earthly Jesus is the dwelling place of the Shekinah becomes understandable. At the same time it is apparent how this conception could be expanded in terms of the congregation as the temple, and it is clear which conception is prior and which a later development. Legitimate as the Christological development may be, in understanding the teaching of Jesus it is essential to understand his mission in terms of the community, since the synoptic gospels are permeated with this conception. The parables of growth imply not only that the kingdom has come but that it has come in the community around Jesus, in which the seed he planted will bear fruit and grow into the new world. The cleansing of the temple implies a contrast between the temple of sacrifice for Israel and the spiritual temple for the nations. In the controversy story Mk 2:1-12 it is the community, the "Son of Man on earth", which has been given the authority to forgive sins. Because temple law overrides Sabbath law, it is the community, the Son of Man, which is lord also over the Sabbath (Mk 2:28). We see now the reason for the neuter μένζον in the statement "more than the temple is here" (Mt 12:6). "Jesus claims that something more important than the Temple and its ritual has come into the world. That something is the kingdom of God."² The key to under-

¹ Göttingen, 1942; English: *Lord of the Temple*, Edinburgh, 1961.

² T. W. Manson, *The Mission and Message of Jesus*, New York, 1938, p. 479.

standing Jesus' attitude to the Jerusalem cult lies in his conception of the kingdom of God as the new temple.

It has become customary in speaking of the kingdom of God to call Jesus the *αὐτοβασιλεία*.¹ In a very profound sense this is true, but it is not very helpful in elucidating Jesus' own teaching. He spoke not of himself but of his mission, and the kingdom of God was for him not something he was but something whose arrival he came to announce, even to bring into being.² Just as the new temple is something which Jesus builds and into which he calls men to enter, so the kingdom of God is something which is given to Jesus' followers (Lk 12:32; 22:29; Mt 21:43). The sayings "the kingdom of God is at hand" (Mk 1:15) and "in three days I will build" the new temple (Mk 14:58) are but two ways of saying the same thing. When we consider the parallels in the saying: "The Son of Man must suffer many things. . . and after three days rise again" (Mk 8:31), it is apparent that further discussion will be necessary in order to show the connection of kingdom of God = Son of Man = new temple. The connection between kingdom of God and church, new temple and eschatological Jerusalem, also needs further discussion. For the present we hope to have demonstrated that the new temple was an important concept in the teaching of Jesus and is indeed closely bound up with his understanding of the kingdom of God.³ For him this term means not an abstract reign of God but a concrete realm of salvation. This realm is directly connected with the temple in such sayings as Mt 10:25b; 12:6; Mk 11:17; 15:29, and the connection may be presupposed in many more. Against this background there is no need to deny the authenticity of the distinctively temple saying Mt 16:17-19, "On this (foundation-)rock I will build my community (=new temple)". And certainly we must include among the important authentic sayings of Jesus his promise to build a new temple in three days (Mk 14:58).

¹ So with impressive emphasis K. L. Schmidt, *TWNT*, I, 573-595, pp. 590-592.

² In this connection it is perhaps not too fanciful to point out that Peter was confused when he said on the mount of Transfiguration, "we shall make three tabernacles, one for you and one for Moses and one for Elijah" (Mk 9:5). In fact Jesus would make a tabernacle for Peter, the church, and not Peter for Jesus.

³ On the connection of kingdom and temple in Qumran, cf. 1QSb IV, 24-26: "And may you serve like an angel of the presence in the holy dwelling (temple) to the glory of the God of hosts forever. And may you be round about as a server in the palace of the kingdom and cast the lot with the angels of the presence."

4. CONCLUSION

We began with the saying behind Mk 14:58, "I will destroy this temple and in three days I will build it." We distinguished this saying from a mere prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem as in Mk 13:2, "they will not leave stone on stone that will not be thrown down," because it seemed to involve a hostile attitude to the temple as such. At first it appeared that it could not be a genuine saying of Jesus. On the basis of the Markan controversy stories we surmised that the early church would have nothing to do with the cult of the Jerusalem temple. While the anti-cultic polemic of the early church may well have been intensified by contemporary controversies, their practice can be explained best on the basis of the teaching of Jesus, and here it is astonishing how Jesus seems to have ignored all cultic questions and to have by-passed the Jerusalem temple completely in connection with the basic question of cultic uncleanness.

Jesus was not interested in destroying the Jerusalem temple, and the statement that he would do so seems to have been transmitted as part of the anti-Christian Jewish polemic. We inquired into the source of this polemic. It could not be an apocalyptic tradition, for a close investigation has shown that while this tradition can speak quite strongly about cleansing the temple even to the point of destruction, this is never connected with the hope for the building of a new temple. As for the Messiah, there is no evidence whatsoever that he would build a new temple. Vehement opposition to the Jerusalem temple was expressed at Qumran and among baptist groups and the Samaritans, and at a later time we find a very similar opposition on the part of the Ebionites. Jesus could not provide the link between the two, but this role could be admirably filled by Stephen. We concluded then that the first half of the saying Mk 14:58 is not a genuine saying of Jesus but goes back to Stephen.

If the saying Mk 14:58 was transmitted by the anti-Christian polemic, it seems that any reference to the Jerusalem temple in the second half rested on a misunderstanding. It was seen to be impossible to retain both halves of the saying together, and so we investigated the second half concerning building the new temple separately. Here we found a direct line which led from the understanding of Qumran through 2 Cor 6:14ff to numerous passages in the New Testament epistles, where the new temple was used figuratively

of the community. This line was crossed however by two tendencies which identified Jesus with the temple and the stone. We saw that a stone theology is not a presupposition of but a development from the stone passages of the New Testament, and that these passages have their origin not in a conception of Jesus as the temple but in the passion apologetic of the early church as the rejected stone of Ps 118:22. The temple testimony of Is 28:16 was seen to have been applied to the community before it was ever applied to Jesus. The image of the temple as the community was found to be not a Pauline creation but a way of speaking characteristic of the Jerusalem church.¹ In the teaching of Jesus the kingdom of God was seen to represent not a reign but a realm and thus to be quite parallel to the concept of the Jerusalem temple. Accordingly we concluded that the image of the temple as the community goes back not only to the Jerusalem church but to Jesus himself, and that therefore the saying "in three days I will build it (the new temple)" is a genuine saying of Jesus.

We have in our study up to the present insisted on two distinctions. One is between two very closely related concepts: opposition to the temple and opposition to the cult. The reason for this should now be clear: in reference to a new temple the former would have to hope for a literal restoration, while the latter could interpret the concept figuratively in non-cultic terms. While both concepts were held at Qumran, they were not necessarily related. In the early church we find Jesus opposed to the cult as such, but Stephen to the temple. But since the two attitudes are related, it should not surprise us to see them come together again, and in fact we see this in the Gospel according to Mark. This will be investigated in Chapter V. Another distinction was between the destruction of the temple and the destruction of Jerusalem. These two also come together in Mark, in a way which has important consequences for the eschatology of the early church. Before we come to this, however, we should first discuss the destruction of Jerusalem as such. Since unambiguous passages dealing with the fall of Jerusalem are found in the synoptic gospels almost exclusively in Luke, we shall turn to a discussion of this gospel and the traditions contained therein.

¹ Also the concept of "entering" the kingdom of God is "ein spezifisch palästinisches Bild" (Jeremias, *TWNT*, III, 743, 3).

CHAPTER FOUR

THE FALL OF JERUSALEM AS A POLITICAL EVENT IN LUKE-ACTS

In our discussion of the saying Mk 13:2, "there will not be left here stone upon stone which will not be thrown down," we maintained that the Markan application of the saying to the temple was secondary to the tradition of Lk 19:44, where the same saying is applied to the city of Jerusalem. Now we must turn to this latter setting and the predictions of the fall of Jerusalem. Immediately we come across an astonishing fact: all of the explicit references to the destruction of the city are to be found in the special material of the gospel of Luke, in 19:39-44; 21:20-24; 23:28-31, and 13:34-35, the latter passage also in Q, Mt 23:37-39. The usual explanation today of this strange situation is to say that this is an editorial modification whereby Luke "historizes" Mark's eschatological conception of the city. This seems on the face of it most improbable. Those who would most naturally be interested in the fate of Jerusalem are not Gentile Christians after A.D. 70, but Jerusalemites, both Christians and Jews, before this date. Our thesis will be that the predictions of the destruction of Jerusalem have a natural *Sitz im Leben* in the missionary preaching of the church to the inhabitants of the city. This means that Luke is using an older source in those passages concerning Jerusalem, and it will be necessary for us to sketch something of the theology of this source in order to put the predictions in their proper setting. In spite of all that has been said against it, it seems advisable to retain the designation Proto-Luke.

I. THE THEORY OF PROTO-LUKE

The thesis that the Lukan special material constituted a special source, covering essentially the whole gospel from Lk 1:5 to 24:53, was first stated by P. Feine.¹ According to him this source was written by Jewish Christians in the church of Jerusalem about A.D. 67. It is important to note that the birth stories of Lk 1-2 were

¹ *Eine vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas*, Gotha, 1891.

included. An elaboration of Feine's theory was given by B. Weiss,¹ which however does not differ considerably in approach, and by attempting to distinguish too precisely between Q and L endangered the plausibility of the whole theory. At about the same time, but independently of his German colleagues, E.D. Burton² in Chicago worked out a complex source theory for Luke including a) the birth stories, b) a "Perean document" (Lk 9:51 - 18:14; 19:1-28), and c) a "Galilean document" (special Luke in 3:7 - 8:3), alongside of Mark. He saw that "Q" material could not be separated from special Lucan material but belonged to it from the very beginning. An interesting historical and theological study of the material in the "Perean document" was presented by E.W. Parsons.³ The most important study to come from this school was Perry's work on the passion story.⁴ By very careful philological and historical analysis, Perry not only isolated Luke's special tradition of the passion but also gave a good beginning to an exposition of the theology of this tradition, which he thought could be dated in Jerusalem about A.D. 45. From another perspective, B.S. Easton worked out in great detail lists of the special vocabulary of the Lucan source "L".⁵ This painstaking work has unfortunately not been utilized by his successors.

The classic theory of Proto-Luke was stated by B.H. Streeter⁶ and elaborated in some detail by V. Taylor.⁷ They make little reference to their predecessors, except for Perry, and are little concerned with elaborating any special theology of their proposed source. Nevertheless, especially Taylor stated the theory in its fullest and best founded form to date. In spite of the protestations of both

¹ *Die Quellen des Lukasevangeliums*, Stuttgart, 1907. F. Spitta, *Die synoptische Grundschrift in ihrer Überlieferung durch das Lukasevangelium*, Leipzig, 1912, sees the problem clearly but obscures his analysis by contending for an Urevangelium used also by Mk and Mt.

² *Some Principles of Literary Criticism and their Application to the Synoptic Problem*, Chicago, 1904. Cf. the clear presentation of this theory in H. B. Sharman, *The Teaching of Jesus about the Future*, Chicago, 1909, pp. 23 ff. and enclosed tables.

³ *A Historical Examination of Some Non-Markan Elements in Luke*, Chicago, 1914.

⁴ A. M. Perry, *The Sources of Luke's Passion-Narrative*, Chicago, 1920.

⁵ "Linguistic Evidence for the Lucan Source L," *JBL* 29 (1910), 139-180, and "The Special Source of the Third Gospel," *JBL* 30 (1911), 78-103. Cf. also his *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, Edinburgh, 1926.

⁶ Most accessibly in *The Four Gospels*, London, 1924, pp. 201-222.

⁷ *Behind the Third Gospel*, Oxford, 1926.

that the scientific basis for the theory concerned Luke's use and non-use of Mark, attention tended to focus on their very speculative reconstruction of the genesis of the writing. They began with the verifiable assertion that fairly faithful extracts from Mark had been inserted into the already existing framework of the non-Markan material (thus not separating Q and L), but the account of how and why this happened reads almost like a novel. Assuming that the "tendency" of the special material did not differ from that of the finished Luke-Acts, they held Luke to be the author of both. While traveling with Paul, Luke not only kept a diary later to be incorporated into Acts (the "we-sections") but also made notes on the history of Jesus and joined them with a copy of Q while he was staying two years with Paul at Caesarea. Proto-Luke was then a personal first draft of a gospel, later to be expanded by the incorporation of Markan material and followed by Acts.¹ Thus the statistical evidence for the existence of a non-Markan source tended to be lost along with the pretentious claim to know too much about the literary activities of Luke. Also because of a subjective impression about the appropriateness of the chronology of Lk 3:1f as the beginning of a gospel, the birth stories were deleted from Proto-Luke and with them the best support for a separate theological conception—indeed, supposedly there was no difference in theology between Luke and Proto-Luke. More seriously, Luke as an editor was completely ignored when it was assumed that Proto-Luke was simply what was left when all the Markan material was removed. For these reasons the theory did not have the impact it deserved. It found no acceptance in Germany, partly because the more elaborate theories of Bussmann were felt to explain the same phenomena in another way, but even more because the rise of form-criticism dampened all interest in sources anyway. Then with the advent of *Redaktionsgeschichte*, all interest turned to the point most neglected by Streeter and Taylor, the theology and editorial work of Luke. In the English-speaking world the prestige of Creed,² who rejected the theory, brought further work on it to a halt, and

¹ H. W. Montefiore, "Does 'L' hold Water?," *JTS* 12 (1961), 59-60, has carried this whole theory to a tongue-in-cheek extreme by pointing out that the document Luke was carrying with him from Caesarea to Rome would have been lost in the shipwreck!

² J. M. Creed, *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, London, 1930.

although it is often respectfully mentioned,¹ it has remained only an interesting theory.

Proto-Luke was revived in a very unique form by H. Sahlin.² Renewing an hypothesis of Torrey, he maintains that Proto-Luke was a document written by a Jewish-Christian in the 50's, extending from Lk 1:5 to Acts 15:33, whereby Lk 1:5 - 3:7a were in Hebrew and the rest in Aramaic. When Luke wrote an apology for Paul's trial (essentially Acts 22-28; the preface Lk 1:1-4 refers mainly to this), he translated and incorporated the earlier Proto-Luke, making a number of modifications, the most important of which was the dovetailing of Pauline narratives into the first part of Acts. Lk 24:50-53 and Acts 1:1-5 are creations of the second century, when the Lukan work was divided into two parts.³ Although there is much in this general reconstruction which needs radical correction, many of Sahlin's observations are well founded. With respect to Proto-Luke, he has made two very important contributions: 1. the distinction between Proto-Luke and Luke along with the recognition of extensive revisions by Luke, and 2. the inclusion of the birth stories (and the early parts of Acts). By minute philological and material analysis, Sahlin tries to arrive at the original Proto-Lukan text, and he elaborates the distinctive theology found there. However, such an analysis would have to be continued through the rest of the gospel to be completely convincing. The fact that Sahlin has until now only dealt with Lk 1-3 has enabled him to sidestep the question of Luke's use of Mark. This problem surely will not be solved by his adoption⁴ of Torrey's suggestion that Mark was written already in A.D. 40 and used by Proto-Luke. There is however one possibility

¹ E.g. by P. Parker, "A Proto-Lukan Basis for the Gospel according to the Hebrews," JBL 59 (1940), 471-478; T. W. Manson, "The Work of St. Luke," (1944), now in *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles*, ed. M. Black, Manchester, 1962, pp. 46-67; F. C. Grant, *The Gospels; Their Origin and their Growth*, Nashville, 1957; C. S. C. Williams, "Luke-Acts in Recent Study," *ExTimes* 73 (1961-62), 133-136.

² *Der Messias und das Gottesvolk; Studien zur Protolukanischen Theologie*, Uppsala, 1945; and *Studien zum Dritten Kapitel des Lukasevangeliums*, Uppsala, 1949.

³ *Messias*, pp. 1 ff.; Cf. K. Lake in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Vol. 5, (1933), p. 3 ff.; H. Conzelmann, *Die Mitte der Zeit*, 1960³, p. 86; Ph. Menoud, "Remarques sur les textes de l'ascension dans Luc-Actes," *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann*, Berlin, 1954, pp. 148-156 (but not in his later "Pendant quarante jours (Actes i, 3)," *Neotestamentica et Patristica*, Leiden, 1962, pp. 148-156).

⁴ *Messias*, p. 10.

not considered by Sahlin. The arguments of Harnack¹ for dating Acts before the conclusion of the trial of Paul have been more ignored by New Testament scholarship than satisfactorily answered, and it is not necessary to assume that Acts must have been written after the completed gospel.² The process then might have been something like this:

- c. A.D. 50 - Proto-Luke (Lk 1:5 - Acts 15:33)
- c. A.D. 64 - Greek Proto-Luke and Acts
- c. A.D. 80 - Luke (with Markan additions) and Acts
- c. A.D. 140- Luke and Acts separated

Although the Proto-Lukan theory has not been adopted as a whole by anyone else, a number of scholars have felt obliged to come to similar conclusions. Bornhäuser's study of the Lukan special material³ is a beginning in the direction of elaborating the special theology of these pericopae. Schlatter⁴ spoke of a "neuer Erzähler" as a special source in the Lukan gospel, including the birth and passion stories. This small gospel⁵ was based on first-hand Palestinean tradition, is directed more against Mammon than the Pharisees, and was probably written in Syria. E. Schweizer⁶ posits a special collection of miracle stories ("W") in the Lukan parallels to Mt 8:1-9, 34; 16:13-17:23, but his additional list of Lukan passages with noticeable "Hebraisms" covers almost exactly the traditional Proto-Luke. A special source in Luke 21 has been suggested by Spitta, Manson, Dodd, Winter, and Gaston.⁷ A Proto-Lukan passion story is con-

¹ *The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels*, London, 1911.

² Cf. Roland Koh, *The Writings of St. Luke*, Hongkong, 1953; C. S. C. Williams, "The Date of Luke-Acts," *ExTimes* 64 (1952-53), 283-284; H. G. Russel, "Which Was Written First, Luke or Acts?," *HTR* 48 (1956), 167-174; P. Parker, "The 'Former Treatise' and the Date of Acts," *JBL* 84 (1965) 52-58.

³ *Studien zum Sondergut des Lukas*, Gütersloh, 1934.

⁴ *Das Evangelium des Lukas, aus seinen Quellen erklärt*, Stuttgart, 1960². He was followed by K. H. Rengstorff, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, NTD 3, Göttingen, 1962¹⁰.

⁵ Cf. *Lukas*, pp. 463-471. Schlatter points out the similarity of this source to the tradition behind the Fourth Gospel.

⁶ "Eine hebraisierende Sonderquelle des Lukas?," *ThZ* 6 (1950), 161-185.

⁷ Fr. Spitta, "Die grosse eschatologische Rede Jesu," *TSK* 82 (1909), 348-401; T. W. Manson, "The Sayings of Jesus," in *The Mission and Message of Jesus*, New York, 1938, pp. 615-629; C. H. Dodd, "The Fall of Jerusalem and the 'Abomination of Desolation'," *Journ. of Roman Studies* 37 (1947), 47-54; P. Winter, "The Treatment of his Sources by the Third Evangelist in Luke xxi-xxiv," *Stud. Theol.* 8 (1954), 138-172; L. Gaston, "Sondergut und Markusstoff in Luk. 21," *Theol. Zeit.* 16 (1960), 161-172.

sidered probable by Bultmann¹ and Dodd² and has been defended with special emphasis by Tyson.³ Unfortunately, many recent works do not take into account the work of their predecessors. Thus Rehkopf⁴ demonstrates in great detail the existence of a Proto-Lucan source with Markan additions in Lk 22:21-23, 47-53, but he does not put his findings into the context of a total theory, and his list of words characteristic of the "vorlukanischer Sprachgebrauch" was apparently made without any knowledge of the longer lists of Easton. Grundmann⁵ in his commentary is not quite sure what to make of the theory: he speaks of a Lucan "Sondertradition. . . die vielleicht bereits mit Q verbunden war", and throughout the commentary itself he points out the connection of the individual sections of this Sondertradition, but he avoids explicit adoption of the theory as a whole and does not distinguish very carefully between the theology of Luke and his sources. G.B. Caird⁶ in the most recent commentary on Luke adopts Taylor's theory *in toto*, but the scope of the popular commentary series does not permit him to elaborate it. Perhaps we shall have to wait for a more thorough exposition of the theory of Proto-Luke for the promised commentary from the pen of J. Jeremias.⁷

If the most serious drawback of the classical Proto-Luke theory is that it did not take seriously enough the redactional activity of Luke, current opinion on the third gospel goes to just the opposite extreme. For Conzelmann⁸ every deviation from Mark is seen to be the expression of a specifically Lucan theology, and even the central section of special Lucan material 9:51-18:14 is evaluated as

¹ *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, Göttingen, 1958⁴, p. 302f. But cf. his retraction in the *Ergänzungsheft*, 1958, p. 42.

² *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge, 1963, pp. 50-52.

³ J. B. Tyson, "The Lukan Version of the Trial of Jesus," *NT* 3 (1959), 249-258. Cf. also A. Schlatter, *Die beiden Schwerter, Lukas 22, 35-38; Ein Stück aus der besonderen Quelle des Lukas*, *BFChrTh* 20, 6 (1916), Gütersloh.

⁴ *Die lukianische Sonderquelle, Ihr Umfang und Sprachgebrauch*, Tübingen, 1959.

⁵ *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (ThHKzNT 3), Berlin, 1964², p. 17.

⁶ *Saint Luke* (The Pelican Gospel Commentaries), Baltimore, 1963.

⁷ He has indicated his adherence to the basic theory in "Untersuchungen zum Quellenproblem der Apostelgeschichte," *ZNW* 36 (1937), p. 219; *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu*, Göttingen, 1960³, p. 91-93; *Die Gleichnisse Jesu*, Göttingen, 1956⁴, p. 151, n. 1; "Perikopen-Umstellungen bei Lukas?," *NTS* 4 (1958), 115-119.

⁸ *Die Mitte der Zeit, Studien zur Theologie des Lukas*, Tübingen, 1960³.

a creation of the evangelist.¹ Conzelmann may be right in his characterization of Lucan theology, but in order to make his point convincingly he would have to distinguish much more closely between a Lucan conception and that of his sources. For Conzelmann, Luke tries to explain the delay of the parousia by inventing a *Heilsgeschichte*, thus historicizing the earlier eschatological conceptions. Indeed Luke goes so far in Conzelmann's presentation that it can even be questioned whether he has a rightful place in the canon.² Conzelmann posits a sharp demarcation between the time of Jesus and the time of the church on the one hand, and the time of Jesus and the time of the Old Testament on the other. The former may or may not be correct,³ but the latter certainly is not. Conzelmann's whole thesis about the division between Jesus and the time of salvation, John and the time of the Old Testament, is based on one notoriously difficult text, Lk 16:16 ("The law and the prophets were until John; since then the kingdom of God is preached and every one forces his way into it.").⁴ To support his thesis about this one text, Conzelmann goes to extraordinary lengths: he simply ignores the passages in the birth stories whose meaning is clear but which contradict his theory!⁵ Conzelmann's thesis is not really

¹ A similar neglect of any discussion of sources in favor of evaluating everything as a Lucan conception characterizes E. Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, Göttingen, 1959¹²; cf. the protest of R. Bultmann, "Zur Frage nach den Quellen der Apostelgeschichte," *New Testament Essays, Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson*, ed. A. J. B. Higgins, Manchester, 1959, pp. 68-80.

² Cf. the earlier study by P. Vielhauer, "Zum 'Paulinismus' der Apostelgeschichte," *EvTheol* 10 (1950), 1-15 (*Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament*, Munich, 1965, pp. 1-27); and E. Käsemann, "Das Problem des historischen Jesus," *ZThK* 51 (1954), 125-153 (*Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*, I, Göttingen, 1960, pp. 187-214), especially p. 137f. (198f.).

³ Cf. the criticisms of W. C. Robinson, Jr., *Der Weg des Herrn; Studien zur Geschichte und Eschatologie im Lukas-Evangelium*, Hamburg, 1964; H. Flender, *Heil und Geschichte in der Theologie des Lukas*, Munich, 1965; H. W. Bartsch, "Early Christian Eschatology in the Synoptic Gospels (A Contribution to Form-critical Research)," *NTS* 11 (1965), 387-397.

⁴ It is remarkable that Conzelmann never gives an exegesis of the text itself; for some of the problems cf. W. G. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfillment*, London, 1957, pp. 121-124; D. Daube, "Violence to the Kingdom," *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, London, 1956, pp. 285-300.

⁵ "Von der Vorgeschichte sehen wir ab. Deren Anschauung ist zusammengefasst in 1, 17 und 1, 76." (p. 16, n. 2) This procedure is hardly justified by his statement p. 109, "die Authentizität der beiden ersten Kapitel sei fraglich (weshalb wir auch ihre besonderen Theologumena ausklammern)." Does Conzelmann mean by questionable authenticity that ch. 1-2 were not part of *Luke's* gospel?

salvaged by H.H. Oliver,¹ who wants to find his schema also in the birth stories: the prophet of the Most High designates the Baptist and the period of Israel, the Son of the Most High Jesus and the middle of time, and the Power of the Most High the Holy Spirit and the period of the church. But such a periodization is completely foreign to these chapters. Both Taylor and Conzelmann, each in his own way, neglect the birth stories. We on the other hand shall concentrate on them, to try to correct some of the defects of Taylor's presentation of Proto-Luke. If there are any defects in Conzelmann's characterization of Luke, they may be left for others to discover, for our interest is exclusively with the tradition behind Luke.

The following arguments for the existence of Proto-Luke seem to be the most important. If one simply tables the material of the third gospel as Mk, Q, and L, it will be found that while the Markan material stands unalloyed in four great blocks² up to the passion story, Q and L material are so intertwined that it is difficult to separate them. Since it is doubtful whether we should consider Q to have been an actual document,³ this means that the Q and L material is a unity, parallels to some of which are also to be found in Matthew. Following the example of Jeremias,⁴ the situation can be schematically portrayed as follows:

<i>Q and L material</i>	<i>Markan material</i>
1. Lk. 1:5-4:30	
3. Lk 6:12-8:3	2. Lk 4:31-6:11 = Mk 1:21-3:6
	4. Lk 8:4-9:50 = Mk 4:1-9:40 (except 4:26-34; 6:45-8:26)
5. Lk 9:51-18:14	6. Lk 18:15-43 = Mk 10:13-52
7. Lk 19:1-48	8. Lk 20:1-21:4 = Mk 11:27-12:44
9. Lk 21:5-24:49 (with Markan insertions)	

¹ "The Lucan Birth Stories and the Purpose of Luke-Acts," *NTS* 10 (1964), 202-226.

² Of course one could also say that the Q and L material stands unalloyed in five great blocks, and only a closer examination can determine which was primary.

³ The arguments of J. Jeremias, "Zur Hypothese einer schriftlichen Logienquelle Q," *ZNW* 29 (1930), 147-149, have recently been given additional support by B. Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript*, Uppsala, 1961. Cf. also S. Petrie, "'Q' is only what you make it," *NT* 3 (1959), 28-33.

⁴ *Abendmahlsworte*, p. 92.

We must immediately correct this oversimplified outline by pointing out that a Proto-Lucan pericope (5:1-11, Peter's draft of fish) is found in a Markan block, and two Markan pericopae in a Proto-Lucan block (19:29-36, 45f, entry into Jerusalem, and 22:1-13, preparation for Passover). Nevertheless, it is clear which column has priority: the one on the left not only has both the beginning and end of the gospel, but taken by itself it reads like a complete gospel. The Markan extracts, on the other hand, read like exactly that, four unconnected extracts, and almost half of Mark's gospel has been omitted. This becomes more significant when we consider such stories told in both sources as the Beelzebul controversy, the rejection in Nazareth, and the anointing of Jesus.¹ In every case the Proto-Lucan version is followed in its context while the Markan version is omitted.

As we have seen, the thesis that Luke is dependent on another source besides Mark in the passion story has won more approval than has the Proto-Luke theory generally. Aside from literary considerations, one big argument in favor of it is that it makes more sense historically.² If one examines those verses with the closest parallel in Mark, then it can be seen that Luke deviates from the Markan order of events some dozen times, which does not accord with his use of Mark in the other parts of his gospel,³ and yet these Markan verses considered by themselves are all in Mark's own order. The reasonable conclusion is that they have been inserted into an already existing context to supplement it. In his investigation of Lk 22:21-23, 47-53, Rehkopf found Markan insertions in Vs 20b and 52b-53a. To these we can add Lk 22:19, 34, 54a-62; 23:3, 26, 34b, 44f, and part of 50-54. If this is the case in the passion story, it might

¹ Possible parallels in Proto-Luke to a Marcan pericope which has been omitted include besides the three mentioned (Lk 14:14-22; 4:16-30; 7:36-50) also Lk 5:1-11 (call of Peter), 6:38 (full measure), 10:25-28 (lawyer's question), 11:29 (no sign), 12:1 (leaven of Pharisees), 12:10 (sin against Holy Spirit), 13:18f parable of mustard seed), 17:1-2 (causing sin), 17:6 (faith like mustard seed), 22:24-28 (dispute about greatness).

² Cf. the compelling arguments of Tyson, art. cit.

³ W. G. Kümmel (Feine-Behm), *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Heidelberg, 1965¹⁴, seeks to counter Jeremias' argument that Luke has no pericopae out of the Markan order before the passion by pointing to Lk 4:16-30; 5:1-11; 3:19f; 16:12-19; and 8:19-21. But with the exception of the last pericope mentioned all of these passages are in Proto-Luke and do not represent any change with respect to Mark whatsoever.

also be true elsewhere, and I have in another place given reason for believing that Markan additions are to be found in Lk 21:8-9, 16-17, 21a, 23a, 27.¹ Also in the account of John the Baptist, Lk 3:3b, 16b are from Mark, and there are other smaller additions. In these three passages then, where parallel accounts occurred in Proto-Luke and Mark, Luke did not prefer his own source over Mark, but contrary to his usual practice supplemented it with Markan extracts. It is their obvious character as extracts into an already existing source which makes this one of the strongest arguments for the existence of a Proto-Luke.

The weakest point in the Proto-Luke theory has not often been noticed by its critics, as Taylor points out.² If Proto-Luke was supposedly once a complete gospel, there are now two obvious gaps, one before Lk 22:14 and the other before Lk 9:51. In the first case we can only assume that there once existed a Proto-Lucan introduction to the supper, but that it has been completely supplanted by the inserted Markan version, a very weak argument to be sure. In the second case we are a bit better off, for commentators have long remarked that Luke seems to have had another source besides Mark for the transfiguration. The same is true of two passages on either side, Lk 9:7-9 and perhaps 9:44. It is not unreasonable to suppose that this "other source" was Proto-Luke, even though there is no possibility of satisfactorily disentangling it, and this assumption then fills very well the gap between Lk 8:3 and 9:51.

Taylor's Proto-Luke must be supplemented at both ends, for the most important argument for the existence of such a document lies in its unified non-Lucan theology. The birth stories were omitted by Taylor for two reasons: 1. the chronology Lk 3:1-2 looks like the beginning of a gospel, and 2. the genealogy Lk 3:23-38 should have been in the earlier chapters had they been part of Proto-Luke.³ Against the first point we can say that this proclivity for dating important events is not isolated, appearing also in Lk 1:5 ("in the days of Herod king of Judea") and 2:1f ("in the days when... Quirinius was legate in Syria"), and that it is not at all certain that

¹ Art. cit.

² "Important Hypotheses Reconsidered. I. The Proto-Luke Hypothesis," *ET* 67 (1955-56), 12-16.

³ Rehkopf, *Lukanische Sonderquelle*, p. 90, repeats this argument without examining it.

the Proto-Lucan chronology was as elaborate as in the present text.¹ For the second point, our feelings about the appropriateness of the position of a genealogy might not at all correspond to ancient sensibilities (cf. Ex 6:14-27).² Or alternatively, the genealogy might have been inserted here by Luke, for 4:1 follows quite naturally on 3:22. It is very precarious to build too much on such arguments, especially when the connection of the content of Lk 1-2 with Proto-Luke is so close.

At the other end we can provisionally adopt Sahlin's conception that Proto-Luke continued on through the early chapters of Acts, Lk 24:49 being followed directly by Acts 1:6b. It then extended through the Council of Jerusalem Acts 15:33, with the exclusion of those passages dealing with Paul.³ This whole reconstruction surely needs modification, for it does not take enough into account the creative activity of Luke or the recognized unity of the book of Acts as a whole. Nevertheless, there are enough correspondences between the theology of Proto-Luke and that of much of the early chapters of Acts that these must somehow be taken into consideration. If the Sahlin conception has been uncritically accepted here, it is only in order to include also early material in Acts in our discussions.

A theory of Proto-Luke cannot today be simply adopted until a great deal more work has been done on it. It will not be presupposed in the present work, which can be looked on simply as a study in the Lucan special material. At the same time, it is to be hoped that this study will show enough internal consistency to assist others in working out a more thorough Proto-Luke theory along with the necessary distinction of Luke's own extensive editing. We shall assume along with most scholars that Luke was written for Gentile Christians sometime after the fall of Jerusalem, but our concern will be with those aspects of his gospel which do not fit

¹ Sahlin, *Dritten Kapitel*, pp. 7-10, suggests that Proto-Luke had only: "in the fifteenth year of the government of Caesar Tiberius, when Pilate was procurator in Judaea and Herod Tetrarch of Galilee and Hannas was High Priest . . ." The longer list presents difficulties no matter who wrote it, but the suggestion of Koh, *op. cit.*, that the gospel was written for the inhabitants of the Decapolis, the area covered, is unlikely on other counts.

² So Sahlin, *Dritten Kapitel*, pp. 91-93.

³ In view of the affinity of Paul's speech Acts 13:16-49 to the earlier speeches of Acts, Sahlin assumes that these verses originally stood after Acts 11:24a as a speech of Barnabas.

in with this situation. Although the Aramaic background of some of the material seems to be clear, it would be well not to advance any hypotheses as to when or by whom it was translated. The Proto-Luke theory is not bound by such speculative reconstructions but stands or falls on the basis of observations concerning the use and non-use of Mark. Also, although it is clear that Luke must have modified Proto-Luke just as much as he did Mark, there are as yet not enough established criteria to enable us in most cases to distinguish precisely the earlier from the final form of Lucan special material. For the sake of reference, a list of passages which have been assumed to have come from Proto-Luke is appended as follows:

1:5-25	Annunciation to Zechariah
1:26-38	Annunciation to Mary
1:39-45, 56	Meeting of Mary and Elizabeth
1:57-66, 80	Birth of John the Baptist
2:1-20	Birth of Jesus
2:21-40	Simeon and Anna in the temple
2:41-52	Jesus in the temple
(1:46b-55	<i>Magnificat</i>)
(1:68-79	<i>Benedictus</i>)
3:1-3a, 4-16a, c, 17-20	Proclamation and rejection of John the Baptist
3:21-22; 4:1-13	Baptism and temptation of Jesus
(3:23-38	Genealogy)
4:16-30	Proclamation and rejection of Jesus in Nazareth
5:1-11	Call of first disciples
6:12-19	Call of the Twelve
6:20-49	Sermon on the Plain
7:1-10	Healing of the centurion's servant
7:11-17	Raising of the widow's son at Nain
7:18-35	Jesus and John
7:36-50	The sinner in the house of Simon
8:1-3	The women disciples
9:7-9	Herod's curiosity
9:28-36	Transfiguration
9:51-62	The road to Jerusalem; Jesus is more than Elijah
10:1-24	Teaching for disciples and missionaries
10:25-37	Against the Pharisees

10:38 - 11:13	Teaching for disciples
11:14-52	Against the Pharisees
12:2-53	Eschatological teaching for disciples
12:54 - 13:35	Warning to Israel
14:1-24	Against the Pharisees
14:25-35	Teaching for disciples
15:1-32	Against the Pharisees
16:1-31	Against riches
17:1-19	Teaching for disciples
17:20 - 18:8	Warning to Israel
18:9-14	Against the Pharisees
19:1-10	Zacchaeus
19:11-28	Parable of the pounds
19:37-44, 47-48	Entry into Jerusalem
21:5-7, 20, 21b, 22, 23b, 24, 10-11, 25-28, 37-38	Warning to Jerusalem
(21:12-15, 18-19 Persecution of disciples)	
22:14-18, 24-33, 35-51, 52a, 53b, 54a, 63-71	} Passion story
23:1-2, 4-25, 27-34a, 35-37, 39-43, 46-49, 55-56	
24:1-49, Acts 1:6b-11	Resurrection and Ascension
1:12 - 5:42	The church in Jerusalem
6:1 - 7:58a, 59b-60; 8:2	Acts of Stephen
8:5-40	Acts of Philip
9:32 - 11:18	Acts of Peter
11:19-24a; 13:16-41; 11:24b, 27-30	Acts of Barnabas
15:1-22, 30-33	Council of Jerusalem

2. THE BIRTH STORIES

One main reason for assuming an earlier tradition contained in the Lucan writings is the fact that much of the proclamation seems to be addressed to Israel. An important aspect of this proclamation says that the coming of the Messiah to Israel means the offer of the peace of God to the people of the promise. After A.D. 70 such a proclamation would have seemed a bitter mockery, and the optimistic tone with which parts of the Lucan writings speak of peace as a real possibility is a sure sign of their early origin. At Jesus' birth the angels proclaim "peace on earth to men of God's election" (2:14), and Jesus will "reign over the house of Jacob, on the throne of his father David" (1:32f). Thereby God "has visited and given

redemption to his people" (1:76), who were waiting for the "redemption of Jerusalem" (2:38) and the "consolation of Israel" (2:25). Now God "has helped his servant Israel" (1:54), giving them "salvation from our enemies and from the hand of all who hate us" (1:71). The Messiah has come "to make us without fear, rescued from the hand of our enemies" (1:74), and "to guide our feet in the way of peace" (1:79). Such statements could not have been written at any time after the fall of Jerusalem or to anyone but Jews. We shall turn then first to the birth stories for an announcement of the major themes whose exposition we shall then follow up in the rest of the Proto-Lucan material.

New Testament scholarship has come to a certain amount of consensus concerning the composition of the hymns and narratives of Lk 1-2, although there are still many unanswered questions about their proper interpretation. It is generally agreed that the abrupt change of language following the elegant prologue is an indication that Luke is using earlier sources in these chapters. It was suggested by Völter¹ that one of Luke's sources, comprising essentially Lk 1:5-25, 41-80, was an originally separate legend about the birth of John the Baptist, composed and transmitted in the circle of John's disciples. The story of the annunciation to Mary was supposedly later adapted from this Baptist source, as the introduction, "in the sixth month", viz., of Elizabeth's pregnancy, 1:26, shows. In the Baptist source Gabriel would have appeared to Elizabeth, not to Mary, and announced to her the name of her unborn son, whereupon the infant leaped in her womb. The *Benedictus* said by Zechariah at the birth of John was seen to contain passages which could only refer to Jesus, and after the removal of these Christian expansions we are left with Lk 1:68, 71-75. Some of the more questionable aspects of this reconstruction were eliminated in the analysis of Dibelius.² The Baptist source was restricted to Vs 5-25, 57-66, the annunciation to Mary being a separate legend, and the *Benedictus*, as can be seen by its insertion after Vs 67 rather than after Vs 64, being not part of the Baptist

¹ D. Völter, *Die evangelischen Erzählungen von der Geburt und Kindheit Jesu*, Strassburg, 1911. He is closely followed by Ed. Norden, *Die Geburt des Kindes*, Leipzig, 1924.

² M. Dibelius, *Jungfrauensohn und Krippenkind: Untersuchungen zur Geburtsgeschichte Jesu im Lukas-Evangelium*, 1932 = *Botschaft und Geschichte*; Bd. I *Zur Evangelienforschung*, Tübingen, 1953, pp. 1-78.

birth legend. Also the *Magnificat*, as the doubt about whether to ascribe it to Mary or Elizabeth shows, has an origin separate from the narrative of the visitation, this latter being a composition of Luke. Bultmann's analysis ¹ is similar, except that he presupposes a Greek Baptist document derived from a Hellenistic Baptist sect. Not only the *Benedictus* and *Magnificat* were originally separate "jüdische eschatologische Hymnen" but also the *Nunc Dimittis* of Simeon, Lk 2:28-34a, is clearly a later addition to the text. In the *Benedictus*, Vs 76 and perhaps Vs 76-79 are later additions to the original hymn. P. Vielhauer ² demonstrated fairly conclusively ³ the unity of Vs 76-79 of the *Benedictus*, which is independent of the Hebrew Baptist narratives, but which he maintains also originated in Baptist circles. Finally, this line of development came full circle in the numerous articles by P. Winter devoted to the birth stories. ⁴ He renews the hypothesis of Völter in assuming that the Baptist document, written in Hebrew, originally covered the whole of 1:5-80. The *Magnificat* and Vs 68-75 of the *Benedictus* were originally "Maccabean battle hymns", the latter being expanded with Vs 76-79 by the Baptist writer. A temple source, coming from the circle of James, was responsible for Lk 2:22-39, 41-51a. A Nazorene adapter combined the Baptist and temple sources, changing the annunciation in Chap. 1 to refer to Jesus and adding the story of the birth of Jesus 2:4-21 and the fragments of lyrics in 2:14, 29-32, 34b-35. Finally the whole was translated into Greek, and Luke added 1:1-4 and 2:1-3. The theory appears more complicated than it really is, for Winter's presentation is in essence only a renewal and refinement of Völter's hypothesis. And yet it is the unquestion-

¹ *Syn. Trad.*, pp. 320-328.

² "Das Benedictus des Zacharias (Lk 1, 68-79)," *ZThK* 49 (1952), 255-272 = *Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament*, Munich, 1965, pp. 28-46.

³ At least enough to convince Bultmann, *Ergänzungsheft*, p. 46.

⁴ "The Cultural Background of the Narrative in Luke i and ii," *JQR* 45 (1954), 159-167, 230-242; "Some Observations on the Language in the Birth and Infancy Stories of the Third Gospel," *NTS* 1 (1954), 111-121; "Magnificat and Benedictus-Maccabaeae Psalms?," *Bull. Jn. Ryl. Lib.* 37 (1954-55), 328-347; "Luke 2, 49 and Targum Yerushalmi," *ZNW* 45 (1954), 145-179; "The Proto-Source of Luke 1," *NT* 1 (1956), 184-199; "On Luke and Lucan Sources," *ZNW* 47 (1956), 217-242; "'Nazareth' and 'Jerusalem' in Luke chs i and ii," *NTS* 3 (1957), 136-142; "On the Margin of Luke I, II," *StudTheol* 12 (1958), 103-107; "The Main Literary Problems of the Lucan Infancy Story," *ATR* 40 (1958), 257-264; "Lukanische Miszellen," *ZNW* 49 (1958), 65-77.

ing acceptance ¹ of the Baptist provenance of the material concerning John which seems to other scholars to be improbable.

In his detailed study of Luke 1-2, H. Sahlin ² posits a unified Hebrew original, the beginning of his Proto-Luke, written by a Jewish Christian in the fifties of the first century. Especially impressive is the unified theological conception Sahlin develops. By a translation back into Hebrew, he is able to distinguish between the Lucan additions and modifications ³ and the original Proto-Lucan conception. This leads Sahlin to assume two great transpositions, which have met with little approval. He thinks the *Magnificat* was originally a hymn of Zion, spoken by Zechariah after 1:64. The *Benedictus* would have stood in Proto-Luke after 2:28 as a hymn of Anna to the new-born Jesus. While it could have happened as Sahlin suggests, there is no evidence to show that it did so happen. Correct in his observation is the fact that the hymns are but loosely placed in their context and that the content of the *Benedictus* clearly refers to the Messiah. The presence of a Zion theology in these chapters should also be acknowledged as firmly established. Sahlin is not alone in insisting on the unity of Lk 1-2. Benoit ⁴ rejects not only a Baptist document but also a Hebrew original for all but the *Benedictus*. While his observations about the relation of these chapters to the rest of the gospel are cogent, he gives no detailed philological argument about the language. Unfortunately, Benoit goes back to an interpolation theory of the *Benedictus*, Vs 76f being a Lucan insertion into an original Hebrew Christian hymn. Gniska ⁵ would divide the *Benedictus* into a Messianic psalm and a hymn on the birth of the Baptist, but he thinks both originated in Jewish-Christian circles. Also Burrows and Laurentin ⁶ emphasize the connection of Lk 1-2 with the rest of

¹ As by H. Thyen, "ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΑ ΜΕΤΑΝΟΙΑΣ ΕΙΣ ΑΦΕΣΙΝ ΑΜΑΡΤΙΩΝ," *Zeit und Geschichte*, Bultmannfestschrift, Tübingen, 1964, pp. 97-125, pp. 114ff.

² *Der Messias und das Gottesvolk*, Uppsala, 1945.

³ E.g. Lk 2:23, which shows a complete misunderstanding of the purification of a woman after childbirth.

⁴ P. Benoit, "L'Enfance de Jean-Baptiste selon Luc 1," *NTS* 3 (1957), 169-194.

⁵ J. Gniska, "Der Hymnus des Zacharias," *BZ* 6 (1962), 215-238.

⁶ Eric Burrows, *The Gospel of the Infancy*, London, 1940, maintains that Lk 1-2 were modeled on 1 Sam 1-3. René Laurentin, *Structure et Théologie de Luc i-ii* (Etudes Bibliques), Paris, 1957, suggests a more complicated typology; among other things, Mary represents for him the whole Messianic community, the people of God.

the gospel and deny the use of Baptist sources. Following an observation of Dibelius, Leaney¹ sees that two different conceptions of the birth of Jesus are to be found, and so he posits a source B, Lk 2:1-20, 22-38, with *Magnificat* and *Benedictus*, and a later source A, Lk 1:5-45, 57-66, 80, 56, also by a Christian writer. A good discussion of recent theories concerning Lk 1-2 is given by Wilson.²

From all this investigation we can perhaps arrive at certain conclusions. After the work of Sahlin and especially Winter, it should no longer be doubted that the original language of Lk 1:5ff was Hebrew.³ It also seems clear that different legends have been used, those in Chap 1 conceivably coming from the disciples of John the Baptist, but equally possibly from Christians. It is now agreed that at least some of the hymns were not originally composed to fit their present context, although there is still disagreement about the unity of the *Benedictus*. This is connected with the major problem of Lk 1, the question of Baptist sources.

Considering the complete lack of evidence, it is astounding how unquestioningly the hymns of Lk 1 are assumed to have emanated from Baptist sources. Apart from certain supposedly "polemical" passages in John and Acts, there is no evidence whatsoever to support the view that followers of John the Baptist in the New Testament period looked upon their master as Messiah and themselves as rivals to the young Christian church.⁴ To use the "polemi-

¹ A. R. C. Leaney, "The Birth Narrative in St. Luke and St. Matthew," *NTS* 8 (1961-62), 158-166.

² R. McL. Wilson, "Some Recent Studies in the Lucan Infancy Narratives," *Studia Evangelica* I (TU 73), Berlin, 1959, pp. 235-253.

³ The arguments of Turner, "The Relations of Luke I and II to Hebraic Sources and to the Rest of Luke-Acts," *NTS* 2 (1956), 100-109, have been adequately answered by Winter, *ZNW* 47 (1956), pp. 217-242.

⁴ The first evidence for the existence of such a Messianic Baptist sect is found in the Clementines, Rec 1:54 ("Yea, even some of the disciples of John, who seemed to be great ones, have separated themselves from the people, and proclaimed their own master as the Christ.") and 1:60 ("And, behold, one of the disciples of John asserted that John was the Christ, and not Jesus, since Jesus himself declared that John was greater than all men and all prophets.") Vielhauer (p. 268f) appeals to J. Thomas, *Le Mouvement Baptiste en Palestine et Syrie*, Gembloux, 1935, as evidence that the Baptists revered John as Messiah at an early date, but wrongly so, for Thomas makes the point that this development occurred "par opposition au Messie des Chrétiens." As for Baptist influence in the *Benedictus*, Thomas says, "ne voyons-nous pas les premiers (scil. les Chrétiens) utiliser des traditions baptistes, ne les entendons-nous pas exalter Jean-Baptiste, ce qu'ils n'au-

cal" texts to demonstrate the existence of such a Baptist Messianic sect, and then the sect to explicate the polemic would be of course to argue in a circle.¹ Part of the reason for the suggestion of a messianic sect revering the Baptist are the hymns of Lk 1, which speak of him as more than a mere forerunner of Jesus. Since no Christian could have made such claims for John the Baptist, it is argued, therefore they came from his own followers. The flaw in the argument is that it is precisely a Christian, Luke or Proto-Luke, who has made these claims for John the Baptist by placing the hymns in their present position in the narrative. If we consider the hymns as isolated units, there is nothing whatever to connect them with John the Baptist. To detach the hymns from their context and still to insist on their Baptist provenance, as does Vielhauer, is to beg the question completely. Vielhauer himself² expresses very well the real inappropriateness of the application of the *Benedictus* to John when he says, "Thema der Prophetie über Johannes ist der Anbruch des Heils, Thema der Prophetie des Täufers ist der Anbruch des Gerichts." Not only is the judgment not mentioned in Lk 1, but even more astounding is the lack of reference to the activity which gave John his epithet—baptism. When on the other hand one considers such references as that of the Branch and the horn of salvation in the house of David, the *Benedictus* is plainly messianic, and the only member of the house of David who is likely to be seen as the Messiah in a hymn transmitted by early Christians is Jesus.

Once the hypothesis of a messianic Baptist sect has been put aside, we are left with the original problem: why should a hymn originally referring to Jesus, the *Benedictus*, be applied to John the Baptist?³ This could of course not happen if there were the slightest rivalry between the two, and the very existence of Lk 1-2 is the best evidence that there was no such rivalry when they were composed. "Von einem Zwist zwischen Johannes und Jesus oder

raient certainement pas fait si les relations avaient été déjà tendues?" (p. 113).

¹ Cf. J. A. T. Robinson, "Elijah, John and Jesus," *NTS* 4 (1958), 263-281 = *Twelve New Testament Studies*, London, 1962, pp. 28-52, esp. pp. 48-51.

² Art. cit., p. 267.

³ "Nichtchristliche Lieder und Vorstellungen sind häufig auf Christus übertragen worden, während für den umgekehrten Vorgang innerhalb der Urchristenheit und Alten Kirche jeder Beleg fehlt."—W. Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, p. 70. Similarly Vielhauer, art. cit., p. 265, n. 60.

zwischen den Jüngern des Täufers und den Aposteln hat dieser Evangelist nichts gewusst." ¹ Thus while nothing stood in the way of the application of these hymns to John, there was one element which might suggest the application, for the two hymns applied to him both refer to the prophet like Elijah (Lk 1:17, 76). The annunciation to Zechariah and the *Benedictus* were then made to refer to John the Baptist by someone who shared Mark's identification of the Baptist with Elijah. Who was this someone? Luke avoids taking over from Mark (Mk 1:2, 6; 9:11-13; cf. Mt 11:14; 17:13) any such explicit identification, so it is not likely that he has created the identification here. Proto-Luke, on the other hand, seems to have been moderately protesting against the tendency of some of his material which would have identified Jesus with the prophet like Elijah. It is therefore likely that he either inserted the annunciation to Zechariah into the narrative at 1:14-17 or composed it for this purpose. The *Benedictus* was then attracted to Zechariah because of the parallel between 1:76 and 1:17. If Proto-Luke was responsible for this then he undoubtedly thought that two different people were being referred to in the hymn. But it is equally possible, as Sahlin suggests, that in Proto-Luke the *Benedictus* was the song of Anna, and Luke was the one who transferred it to its present position. In either case the *Benedictus* was an originally independent hymn to the Messiah with no reference to John the Baptist.

Our present concern is with Lk 1-2 as proclamation in Jerusalem, and we shall therefore treat these chapters as a unified part of Proto-Luke. At the same time, it is commonly agreed that at least the *Magnificat* and *Benedictus* were originally separate hymns, and as the theology of these chapters is expressed primarily in the lyric sections, our exegesis will concentrate first on the hymns as such. Then we shall consider briefly the chapters as a whole before going on to trace further certain themes found here in the rest of Proto-Luke.

Benedictus, Luke 1:68-79

68 Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel,
 for he has visited and given redemption to his people,
 69 and has raised up for us a horn of salvation
 in the house of David his servant,

¹ Schlatter, *Lukas*, p. 178.

- 70 as he spoke through the mouth of his holy prophets from of old —
 71 salvation from our enemies and from the hand of all who hate us;
 72 to show mercy (to our fathers) and to remember his holy covenant,
 73 the oath which he swore to Abraham our father;
 74 to make us without fear, rescued from the hand of our enemies,
 75 so that we might serve (him) in holiness and righteousness before
 him all our days.
 76 And you, child, shall be called the prophet of the Most High,
 for you shall go before the Lord, to prepare his ways;
 77 to give knowledge of salvation to his people in the forgiveness of
 their sins,
 78 through the merciful grace of our God,
 in which the Branch from on high has visited us,
 79 to shine on those who sit in darkness and the shadow of death;
 to guide our feet in the way of peace.

Similar to the Old Testament psalms, the *Benedictus* begins with praise of Yahweh, the God of Israel. The Lord is praised because he has visited his people. While the two aorists ("visited and given") could go back to a Hebrew prophetic perfect, it is more natural to understand them as referring to a real act of the past. The theme of visitation appears again in Lk 7:16; 19:14; Acts 15:14, and must be discussed further. The redemption must be understood in context in a political sense; cf. further Lk 24:21, where the Emmaus disciples say of Jesus, "we had hoped that he was the one who is going to redeem Israel." Vs 69 is of course the main reason for supposing that the *Benedictus* was originally a hymn concerning Jesus, for John the Baptist was not of the house of David. Of the many texts one could quote for the horn as the Messiah, perhaps the most relevant is the 15th of the Eighteen Benedictions, "Let the Branch of David thy servant sprout quickly, and raise up his horn with thy salvation. Blessed art thou, JHWH, who makes sprout the horn of salvation." ¹ Here is not only a parallel to the phrase "horn of salvation" and David as servant (cf. Acts 4:25), but also to the messianic title Branch which appears in Vs 79. The phrase in Vs 70 reappears almost verbatim in Acts 3:21, one of the many parallels between the speeches of Acts and the canticles of Lk 1-2. Vs 71 is an explication of the salvation of Vs 69, and we see clearly that it is meant in a national political sense, "salvation from our enemies and from the hand of all who hate us." The reason

¹ W. Staerk, *Altjüdische liturgische Gebete* (Kleine Texte 58), Berlin, 1930, p. 18. Cf. the Hebrew text of Sir 51:12h (Lévi, p. 74).

for God's action now for the salvation of Israel is to be found in his mercy,¹ in his remembrance of the Sinai covenant and his promises to "Abraham our father" (Vs 72f). The purpose of the action is again Vs 74f expressed in political terms: Israel will be rescued from the hand of their enemies, made to be without fear, so that they might serve the Lord² as a "kingdom of priests and a holy nation" all their days. The psalm up to this point clearly refers to a political Messiah, whom God has raised up in the house of David to save Israel from their enemies.

The transition to a direct address Vs 76 is not untypical of a hymnic style, but the content causes difficulties, for the child is called "prophet of the Most High" and is given the task of preparing the ways of the Lord. While this prophet may well have been the figure of Is 40:3 who prepares the way of the Lord in the wilderness, he could also be understood as the messenger of Mal 3:1. There is however no indication that a different person is meant from the Messiah in the first part of the psalm. We shall return shortly to a consideration of this difficulty. The infinitive of Vs 77 is either subordinate to the preparing of the previous verse or is parallel to the infinitives of Vs 72 and 74. Someone is sent to give knowledge of salvation to Israel, which, perhaps complementing the salvation from enemies spoken about above, consists in the forgiveness of sins. Again (78, cf. 68) this is called a visitation of God. Vs 79 is very difficult to translate,³ but the important thing to realize is that ἀνατολή stands undoubtedly for the Hebrew צִמָּח (cf. Jer 23:5;

¹ Mercy "to our fathers" is difficult, and Sahlin, *Messias*, p. 289f, supposes it to be a marginal gloss referring to Vs 70 after "spoke".

² The double dative αὐτῷ and ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ goes back to a single לפני according to Sahlin, *Messias*, p. 292.

³ Sahlin, *Messias*, p. 296, makes the interesting proposal of an original ἐπιφανεῖ instead of ἐπιφάναι. The change is largely for metrical reasons and makes no essential difference in the sense of the passage, which would then read:

through the merciful grace of our God with which he has visited us.

The Branch from on high will shine on those who sit in darkness (and the shadow of death);

Robinson, art. cit., p. 51, who points out some of the parallels of the *Benedictus* with the speech in Acts 3, would read in Vs 78 the future ἐπισκέπεται to provide a parallel with the future coming of the Christ in Acts 3:20. Thus in both Acts 3 and the *Benedictus* Jesus would be described as the prophet during his lifetime but as the Christ at the parousia. This is to overlook the reference to the horn of salvation in the aorist in Lk 1:69. The aorist is to be read therefore also in Vs 78.

Zech 3:8; 6:12 LXX).¹ The close parallel of the entire *Benedictus* to the petition in the Eighteen Benedictions quoted above should make this clear. The Branch is the Messiah who comes from on high, i.e. from God. The connection with shining is not confined to the word ἀνατολή but existed already in Hebrew,² and there is no need to bring in Hellenistic astrological conceptions. We have translated “shine” rather than “appear” because of the associations of Is 9:1 (“on those who sit in darkness light has shined”), a clearly Messianic passage. The purpose of the shining is given in words very significant for our investigation: “to guide our feet in the way of peace.” This is a theme which we can follow throughout the Lucan writings.

To return to the problem posed by Vs 76, there are three ways to answer it. The simplest is the proposal of Bultmann simply to omit the verse as an addition created to make a messianic psalm apply to the birth of the Baptist. Vs 77, “to give knowledge . . .”, would then be parallel to the other final infinitives in Vs 72 and 74. Vielhauer goes back to the more common position of Gunkel that two hymns are involved, Vs 68-75 and 76-79, and he tries to show the unity of the latter. In fact, what is said of the ἀνατολή does not seem to differ from the task of the “prophet of the Most High”, but to unite the two Vielhauer is forced to ignore the obvious reference to the messianic Branch and translate “Lichterscheinung aus der Höhe”. Vielhauer makes a good case for the fact that “dieser Text ist eine Einheit, entweder ganz christlich oder ganz täuferisch”,³ but the mention of the Branch seems to indicate rather decisively the former, since as we have seen there is no evidence for a messianic understanding of the Baptist at this time. This would also mean that there is no real reason to dispute the

¹ Cf. Schlier, *TWNT* I, 354f, who however prefers the interpretation of the rising star.

² G. H. Box, “The Gospel Narratives of the Nativity and the alleged Influence of Heathen Ideas,” *ZNW* 6 (1905), 80-101, points out that “the Hebrew word צִמַח may very well have been used here by Aramaic-speaking Jews in the Aramaic sense of ‘shining’. Of this interpretation of the Hebrew term there may also be a trace in the LXX of Is 4:3, where the expression יְהִיָּה צִמַח יְהוּה (which was understood of the Messiah) is rendered ἐπιλάμψει ὁ θεός; i.e. the LXX here (as often elsewhere) have interpreted a Hebrew word by an Aramaic parallel. It should be noted also that in the Hebrew of the Midrash the verb צִמַח actually occurs with the meaning ‘shine’, ‘grow bright’.” (p. 97)

³ Art. cit., p. 265.

connection of Vs 76-79 to the clearly messianic Vs 68-75. Sahlin maintains the unity of the whole *Benedictus*, but he too is disturbed by the connection of Vs 76 to the Elijah expectation, which he seeks to remove by supposing a textual corruption: ἐνώπιον he says means "in the presence of", not "before" in the temporal sense, and so Luke would have written only πορεύση without the πορ-.¹ Unfortunately, even in Sahlin's reconstructed Hebrew original, the reference to a forerunner of God, which is given in the "prepare", still stands out. We are left with a difficulty which cannot possibly be removed, that in this hymn a combination has already been made between the Davidic Messiah and the prophet who comes to prepare, perhaps the prophet like Elijah. It was presumably this Vs 76 which led to the attribution of the whole *Benedictus* to Zechariah, even though it had been originally a hymn on the advent of the Messiah Jesus.

The parallels between the *Benedictus* and Peter's speech in Acts 3:12-26 are so striking that they must be considered here. "The God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, the God of our fathers, has glorified his servant Jesus" (cf. Is 53:13). This Jesus, who is called "holy" (cf. Mk 1:24; Jn 6:69; Acts 4:27, 30) and "righteous" (cf. Lk 23:47; Acts 7:32, 52) and the "author of life" (cf. Acts 5:31; Heb 2:10; 12:2), this Jesus was delivered up to death by Peter's hearers. Nevertheless, he goes on in a statement which makes sense only in a situation where preaching to Jerusalemites is taken seriously, "I know that you acted in ignorance, brethren, as did also your rulers." It was foreordained by God and foretold by the prophets that "the Christ should suffer". This strange phrase is a peculiarity of Luke, appearing Lk 24:26f, 45f; Acts 3:18; 17:2f; 26:22f. In view of the early Palestinean origin of 1 Cor 15:3 ("Christ died . . . according to the scriptures"), it is probable that all but the last two passages were already in Proto-Luke. Vs 19-21 seem to be clearly in the Elijah tradition. The messenger of Mal 3:1, who comes to prepare for the coming judgment, is identified with Elijah in Mal 3:23f, "Behold I send you Elijah the prophet before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes. And he will turn (LXX ἀποκαταστήσει) the hearts of fathers to their children and

¹ *Messias*, p. 292f. But ἐνώπιον presumably translates לפני, which definitely can have a temporal sense; cf. the Proto-Lucan passage Lk 9:52, where there is in the word (πρὸ προσώπου = לפני) clear reference to messengers going "before" Jesus.

(MT) the hearts of children to their fathers (LXX the heart of a man to his neighbor), lest I come to smite the land with a curse." Sirach 48:9f says of Elijah that he was "taken up (ἀναλημφθεῖς) into heaven, where he is ready "at the appointed time, according to the scriptures, to calm the wrath of God", "to turn (ἐπιστρέψαι) the heart of the father to the son, and to restore (καταστῆσαι) the tribes of Jacob." (This latter task comes from the Mosaic tradition of the servant of Is 49:6.) The task of Elijah is then a) to call Israel to repentance, b) to obvert the wrath of God, and c) in a word that is peculiarly his, to "restore" (cf. Mk 9:12, "Elijah comes first to restore all things"). Acts 3:19 calls on Israel to repent, that their sins might be blotted out, "that times of refreshing might come from the presence of the Lord." This hardly refers to the age to come but in line with the Elijah tradition to the turning away of the wrath of God within history, a time to breathe before the final judgment. The sentence says the same thing as Vs 26, where God sends his servant to bless Israel in turning everyone from his wickedness. Then "God will send the Christ appointed for you, Jesus, whom heaven must receive until the time of the restoration of all things, of which God spoke through the mouth of his holy prophets from of old." If this text said that God would send Elijah to restore all things, it would be perfectly in line with the traditional Jewish expectation, but instead it is said not only of Jesus, but even specifically of the Christ. The word "Christ" is just as much out of place here as it is in Vs 18, where it is said that the Christ must suffer. To put it another way, the concept of the Messiah is just as much of an intrusion into an Elijah text here as the concept of Elijah is an intrusion into the Messianic text Lk 1:76.

Nevertheless the combination was made, probably already in Proto-Luke. The verbatim recurrence of Lk 1:70 in Acts 3:21b is also an indication of the connection of the two passages, a connection which must have existed before the *Benedictus* was ascribed to Zechariah. The speech in Acts goes on to complicate matters still further, for in Vs 22f Jesus the Christ in the tradition of Elijah is explicitly identified with the prophet like Moses of Dt 18:15, an identification to which we shall return. Also Lk 1:76 speaks of "the prophet" and 1:69 says that God "raised up" a horn of salvation, as in Acts 3:22, 26 God "raised up" his servant Jesus, both being in fulfilment of the covenant given "to our fathers" and "to Abraham" (Lk 1:72f; Acts 3:26). The task of

both figures is to prepare the ways of the Lord, by giving "knowledge of salvation to his people in the forgiveness of their sins" (Lk 1:77); and by blessing "you (his people) in turning every one of you from your wickedness" (Acts 3:26).¹

Annunciation to Zechariah, Luke 1:14-17

- 14 There will be for you joy and exultation,
and many will rejoice at his birth.
- 15 For he will be great before the Lord,
and he will not drink wine or strong drink;
And he will be full of the Holy Spirit
from the womb of his mother.
- 16 And many of the sons of Israel
he will return to the Lord their God.
- 17 And he will go before him
in spirit and in power (of Elijah),
to turn the hearts of the fathers to the sons
and the disobedient through the thoughts of the just;
to prepare for the Lord a people prepared.

If we ignore for the moment the present context of this hymn, it is difficult to identify the person here described. The object of ἀγαλλίασις in the New Testament is always "die eschatologische Heilstat Gottes."² In the narrative Lk 1:44 John rejoices over the birth of Jesus, and the *Magnificat* (1:47) rejoices in the God of salvation. Note that it is here the "many"³ who rejoice at the birth of the subject of this hymn. "He will be great", exactly what is said of Jesus Lk 1:32, cf. 7:16. That he will drink no wine nor strong drink seems to apply literally to John the Baptist but not to Jesus (Lk 7:33 Q). As there is no reference to letting the hair grow (contrast Jud 13:4f), it is questionable whether this reference is to the Nazirate; more likely the figure is thereby characterized as the eschatological high priest (cf. Lev 10:9). That someone should be filled the Holy Spirit already in the womb of his mother is otherwise said only of Jesus (Lk 1:35). The figure here described is evidently of decisive importance in God's salvation for Israel. It is said that he will return many of the sons of Israel to God,

¹ Cf. Acts 5:31, where God exalted Jesus "to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins".

² R. Bultmann, *TWNT* I, 19, 40f.

³ Cf. Acts 6:2, 5; 15:12, 30; and F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*, New York, 1958, p. 231.

a statement which reminds us of the task of Elijah according to Sirach 48:10, not only "to turn the heart of the father to the son" but also "to restore the tribes of Jacob". Thus when Sahlin¹ again tries to eliminate the "προ-" in *προελεύσεται*, the reference to the forerunner of the Lord still remains. On the other hand he is right in his observation that "in the spirit and power of Elijah", where the genitive depends from two nouns, is an impossible construction in Hebrew. The explicit identification with Elijah would then go back at least no further than to the translator and might even be a later gloss altogether. Nevertheless, the task of turning the hearts of the fathers to the sons clearly reflects Mal 3:24a, even if the parallel line differs completely from both MT and LXX. Here the fathers are seen as the disobedient and the sons as the just. Finally, the task of this figure is summed up as that of preparing a people for the Lord.

It is not as easy to detach this hymn from its context as was the case with the *Benedictus*. Although Lk 1:18 follows naturally after 1:13, there is no real evidence that the narrative ever existed without the inserted hymn. We are not helped by a consideration of the content of the hymn, for while some elements seem to apply best to Jesus, others point more toward John the Baptist. In either case the figure is described in terms of the prophet like Elijah even without any specific identification. In view of the parallels in Acts 3:20f and Lk 1:76, it is possible that this was a fragment of a hymn originally referring to the birth of Jesus. It would then have been applied by Proto-Luke to John the Baptist in order to dispute the identification of Jesus with Elijah. Or Proto-Luke may have composed these lines himself for a similar reason. The result is that Jesus and John the Baptist are seen together, much like Moses and Elijah in the transfiguration story or the two Messiahs of Qumran, and together their births signal the beginning of the eschatological era.

Magnificat, Luke 1:46-55

46 My soul magnifies the Lord
 47 and my spirit rejoices in the God of my salvation,
 48 for he has seen the humiliation of his servant;
 for see, from now on all generations will call me blessed.

¹ *Messias*, p. 79f.

- 49 For the mighty one has done great things for me
and holy is his name,
50 and his mercy is from generation to generation
of those that fear him.
51 He has shown strength with his arm,
he has scattered the proud in the thoughts of their hearts.
52 He has unseated the mighty from thrones
and raised the lowly.
53 The hungry he filled with goods
and sent the rich away empty.
54 He has helped Israel his servant
in remembrance of his mercy;
55 as he spoke to our fathers
to Abraham and his seed forever.

There is more agreement about the original independence of the *Magnificat*, and we can justifiably go on to discuss it as such. The first question concerns the speaker of the hymn, the δούλη whose soul praises the Lord and the God of her salvation.¹ Sahlin² makes it very plausible that we should think of the oppressed daughter Zion. There is a very close parallel in 4 Es 9:45, where the woman = Zion (10:44) says, "And after thirty years God heard your handmaid (ancillae) and looked upon my low estate (humilitatem) and considered my distress, and gave me a son." God has already acted to help Zion, an action which will express itself against the proud and the mighty and the rich, and for the sake of the lowly and the hungry (Vs 51-53). Finally, the hymn ends as it began, with the statement that God "has helped Israel his servant". It seems that Israel the παῖς is the same as Zion the δούλη. This passage is not given the full weight it deserves in discussing the New Testament understanding of the *Ebed Yahweh*. The word used here Vs 48 of the δούλη is the same one that Is 53:8 refers to the suffering servant: ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει ἣ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ᾤρηθη. Finally, God has acted to help Israel in fulfilment of the promise "to Abraham and his seed".

Annunciation to Mary, Luke 1:32-33, 35

- 32 He will be great and will be called son of the Most High
and the Lord God will give him the throne of David his father;

¹ Sahlin, *Messias*, p. 172, makes it very plausible that the original was בְּאֵלֵהִי יִשְׁעִי; cf. the same mistranslation in LXX Mic 7:7, Hab 3:13.

² *Messias*, p. 164f. On the daughter Zion cf. alss pp. 182-189.

- 33 and he will reign over the house of Jacob
and of his kingdom there will be no end.
- 35 Holy Spirit will come over you
and the power of the highest will dwell over you
and therefore he who is born will be called holy.

A brief indication of the relevant elements here will be sufficient for our purposes. The parallel between "son of the Most High" and "throne of David his father" shows clearly that the source of the designation Son of God is to be found in Nathan's promise 2 Sam 7: 13f, 16, "He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be his father and he shall be my son . . . your house and your kingdom shall be made sure forever before me; your throne shall be established forever." The reign of the Messiah born in accordance with this promise will be over the "house of Jacob". Vs 35 contains a somewhat different conception. Sahlin's observation¹ that "Son of God" appears to be a later addition is well grounded, but not his proposal to presuppose a מֶלֶךְ underlying ἄγιος. Nevertheless this title does introduce a different conception from that of the messianic Son of God, and it might have once referred to the eschatological high priest. If this verse was composed for its context as an address to Mary, one should probably not read too much into it. It is however very possible that we are dealing with a fragment of a hymn addressing Zion, in which case the passage would be another expression of the community as the temple of God; cf. Ex 40:34f, "the cloud covered the tent of meeting, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle. And Moses was not able to enter the tent of meeting because the cloud abode (ἐπεσκέαζεν = שָׁכַן) upon it."

Annunciation to the Shepherds, Lk 2:10-11, 14

- 10 Do not fear,
for see, I proclaim (to you) great joy
which will be for the whole people;
11 for to you is born today a savior
who is the Messiah of the Lord in the city of David.
- 14 Glory to God in the highest
and on earth peace to men of favor.

The proclamation of the birth of Jesus means great joy for the whole people, i.e. Israel. He who is born is called a savior, a concept

¹ *Messias*, pp. 129ff.

which is otherwise more Hellenistic than Palestinian, but it was chosen here in a Hebrew text because of the word-play ישוע – משיע. Altogether, the concepts σωτήρ and σωτηρία in Proto-Luke have nothing to do with the Hellenistic world savior but refer to the Messianic salvation that has come to Israel; cf. the *Benedictus* Lk 1:69, 71, 77.¹ Along with Winter² we assume that χριστός κύριος is a mistranslation of the Hebrew construct Messiah of Yahweh (cf. 2:26). Sahlin³ makes it plausible that the city of David is in accordance with the Old Testament usage Jerusalem, the city where he reigned and where the Messiah celebrated here will also reign. Sahlin cites the parallel in the Targum to Is 16:5, “Then the Messiah of Israel will establish his throne in righteousness and sit on it in truth in the city of David.” Again, as throughout Lk 1-2, it is a question of the Davidic Messiah come for the redemption of Israel.

The song of the angels is understood most clearly in the Hebrew form proposed by Jeremias:⁴

כבוד לאלהים במרמים
ובארץ שלום באנשי רצון

In this form it is clear that the men of (God's) favor are those whom he has chosen, his people Israel.⁵ Vs 14 does not say anything different from Vs 10, where the joy is “for the whole people.” We are brought a step further in understanding the concept “peace” when we see how peace on earth is parallel to glory in the heavens.

¹ Note the connection of this salvation with Israel, the people of God, Acts 2:49; 4:12; 13:23, 26, and the parallel of σωτήρ and ἀρχηγός in Acts 5:31. Cf. Foerster, *TWNT*, VII, 990ff, 997f, 1015f.

² *ZNW* 49, pp. 67-75; cf. W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, Göttingen, 1921², p. 79. While κύριος could stand in Greek in opposition to χριστός (cf. Acts 2:36 κύριος καὶ χριστός), Sahlin, *Messias*, pp. 214ff., makes a bad mistake when he maintains that the proper translation of משיח יהוה here would be “Messias-JHWH”, identifying the two. He is misled by the curious phenomenon that the same mistranslation is found in LXX Lam 4:20 and Ps Sol 17:36.

³ *Messias*, pp. 218ff. He of course also assumes that the reference in Lk 2:4 is a later addition.

⁴ “Ἀνθρώποι εὐδοκίας (Lc 2, 14),” *ZNW* 28 (1929), 13-20. He is followed by Schrenk, *TWNT*, II, 745ff., and Sahlin, *Messias*, p. 228. Cf. now in the light of the Qumran scrolls E. Vogt, “‘Peace among Men of God's Good Pleasure’ Lk. 2:14,” *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. Stendahl, New York, 1957, pp. 114-117.

⁵ Cf. Vogt, art. cit., p. 117, where the “men of God's good pleasure” are specified as “his chosen ones”.

Shalom is much more encompassing than just peace as the absence of hostility and can be used in the sense of redemption, salvation. Nevertheless, it also included peace in the narrower sense, which will be significant in our further study.

The Canticles of Simeon, Lk 2:29-32, 34f.

- 29 Now let thy servant depart, Lord,
 according to thy word, in peace.
 30 For my eyes have seen thy salvation
 30 which thou hast prepared in the presence of all peoples:
 32 A light for revelation to the nations
 and glory for thy people Israel.
- 34 Behold he is set for the fall or rising
 of many in Israel and as a sign that is spoken against.
- 35 And you, through your soul will a sword pierce,
 so that revealed are the thoughts of many hearts.

These canticles are more firmly attached to their context than are those of Chap. 1. It is nevertheless suspicious that Simeon should have two speeches while Anna should have nothing to say. To eliminate Vs 28-32 with Bultmann¹ because of the "universalistic" tendencies of the first speech is to misunderstand the theology of Proto-Luke in relation to the Gentiles. If these verses once existed as part of an independent hymn, then the context has been composed around them. Also the problem of Anna's silence is solved if we can suppose with Sahlin that in Proto-Luke she spoke the *Benedictus*.

Simeon² was waiting in Jerusalem for the "consolation of Israel", and it was revealed to him that before he die he would see the "Messiah of the Lord" (2:25f). Now the time has come when the goal has been reached and he can "depart in peace, according to thy word", namely that which had been revealed to him, for he has seen God's "salvation". These concepts, "consolation of Israel", "Messiah of the Lord", "peace", and "salvation", are all more or less equivalent, a fact whose importance will be seen. This salvation has been prepared "in the presence of all peoples". The salvation is for Israel, but the Gentiles will see it; cf. Is 52:9f, "The Lord

¹ *Syn. Trad.*, p. 326. He is followed by Grundmann, *Lukas*, p. 88. But it is precisely this first canticle which is most firmly anchored to its context, cf. Sahlin, *Messias*, pp. 252 ff. Strangely also Sahlin would deny to Proto-Luke any universalistic theology; for his solution cf. p. 274, note 1 below.

² His address *δέσποτα* occurs otherwise in the Lucan writings only in the prayer Acts 4:24. Sahlin, *Messias*, p. 254, is probably right in thinking of אֲדֹנָי.

has comforted his people, he has redeemed Jerusalem. The Lord has bared his holy arm before the eyes of all the nations; and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God" (cf. Acts 13:47). This salvation is further described as "light" and "glory", glory for Israel, but light for the nations.¹ Again the background in clearly Second Isaiah, cf. 49:6, "It is too light a thing that you should be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the preserved of Israel; I will give you as a light to the nations, that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth," or 42:6, "I have given you (the servant) as a covenant to the people, a light to the nations." The salvation and consolation which the Messiah brings to Israel are also for the nations; that this final state can be characterized as peace is then significant.

If either of Simeon's two speeches is secondary, then it is that of Vs 34b-35,² for the reference there is not to Mary but to Zion through which a division will go. Almost exactly the same words, *ῥομφαία γὰρ διελύσεται διὰ μέσον σεῖο* are found Or Sib III, 316, where it is a case of a division in a people, Babylon. The saying of Jesus Mt 10:34, "I have come to bring not peace but a sword", is stated in the Lucan parallel 12:51 as "not peace . . . but rather division." Not only does it make little sense to speak of a sword going through Mary, but the use of parentheses in the translations shows that the statement interpreted of Mary has no place in this context. The whole hymn fragment concerns a division within Israel caused by the advent of the Messiah. According to the attitude taken to Jesus "the thoughts of many hearts will be revealed", and Israel will be divided, for some will rise and some will fall (cf. Lk 17:34f), in the crisis brought about by the necessity for decision. In the description of Anna we can again note that the circle in which these narratives took form was that of those who were hoping for the "redemption of Jerusalem" (2:38), a concept parallel to the "consolation of Israel" (Vs 25) mentioned in the case of Simeon.

The story of the twelve year old Jesus in the temple may not

¹ Sahlin, *Messias*, pp. 258ff, would very strangely make Proto-Luke more particularistic than Second Isaiah, when he suggests here a translation error: Luke would have mistakenly read *לְגִלּוֹת* for the intended *לְגִלּוֹת* "a light for the diaspora among the nations."

² In any case the words "and said to Mary his mother" in Vs 34 are to be seen as a Lucan addition, cf. Sahlin, *Messias*, pp. 268f.

have belonged to Proto-Luke.¹ It should however be briefly mentioned at this point because of its conception of the temple. The meaning of the words ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου εἶναι is uncertain. The most natural reading would be "in the things of my father" (cf. I Cor 7:33, τὰ τοῦ κυρίου), but the sense of the story ("how is it that you have sought me?") seems to require a local meaning. "In my father's house" is in any case incorrect, for Jesus is not in the ναός but out in the ἱερόν. While the point of the story probably is to show the relationship of Jesus to "his father",² it is very significant that even in the temple area this is not understood in a cultic sense at all. Jesus' activity in the temple is asking and learning, just as later both he and the early church were to use the temple area as a place of teaching, with no thought of sacrifice. In this sense the story is not out of line with the mood of the birth stories. Proto-Luke knows very well about the functions of the ναός (1:8f, 21f), but for him the significant place is the ἱερόν where one prophesies (2:26) and waits for the "redemption of Jerusalem" (2:37f).

When we look back on the birth stories as a whole, we are left with a number of questions. Not only is there evident a great interest in Israel as the people of the promises, but the stories rejoice confidently and positively that redemption, also in its political sense, has come to Israel in the fullest meaning of the Old Testament expectation. What would be the *Sitz im Leben* of such a proclamation? This is the question asked by MacNeill, and he concludes that "everything in these two chapters . . . is definitely, positively, patriotically, and enthusiastically Jewish"; they are therefore to be seen as "the product of a community somewhere in Judaea, outside Jerusalem, in the period between 50 and 60 A.D."³ The next question is whether this same atmosphere can be traced in the rest of Luke's gospel. Sahlin sums up the theology of these chapters under the rubric, "*Der Messias und das Gottesvolk*". Jesus is called Son of the Most High (1:32) and perhaps "prophet of the Most High" (1:76), but primarily he is seen as the Messiah: the anointed of YHWH (2:11, 26), the horn of salvation (1:69), the Branch (1:78), who will reign over the house

¹ Cf. Schlatter, *Lukas*, pp. 203-205; Sahlin, *Messias*, pp. 308-311.

² Cf. B. van Iersel, "The Finding of Jesus in the Temple. Some Observations on the Original Form of Luke ii 41-51a," *NT* 4 (1960), 161-173.

³ H. L. MacNeill, "The Sitz im Leben of Lk 1.5-2.20," *JBL* 65 (1946), 123-130, pp. 127, 130.

of Jacob (1:33), on the throne of David (1:32), in the city of David (2:11). His function will be to bring salvation (1:69, 71, 77; 2:11, 30) and redemption (1:68; 2:38) to Israel. This will mean great joy (1:14, 44, 47; 2:10) and glory (2:14, 32) and consolation (2:35), and it will mean peace (1:79; 2:14, 29). Israel is seen as the people of God's favor (2:14), the inheritors of the promise to Abraham (1:55, 73), the servant of God (1:48, 54). The Messiah and the people of God—accordingly we shall investigate first the Christology of Proto-Luke and then its attitude to Israel. Finally, the concept of peace will provide a good transition to the sayings concerning the fall of Jerusalem.

3. JESUS, PROPHET AND MESSIAH

It will be necessary to sketch briefly here the Christology of Proto-Luke, if only because of the contradictory conceptions we have already met. Acts 3:19-21 is clearly in the Elijah tradition, and yet these words are applied to Jesus the Messiah. Even more strangely, immediately after the Elijah passage comes the testimony Dt 18:15-19 of the prophet like Moses. We shall find the same modification at several other places in Proto-Luke, enough to indicate that this author sees Jesus not only as the Messiah but also as the prophet like Moses. Indeed, this latter seems to be the main Christological conception for the period of Jesus' lifetime.

The importance of the expectation of the Mosaic eschatological prophet has recently become more and more recognized.¹ The classical scriptural warrant for the figure is Dt 18:15-19, but the real root of the expectation lies in the Exodus tradition itself. Whenever the coming time of salvation is seen in terms of a new Exodus, then it is not surprising to hear that there is often a new Moses to lead it. This is very likely the case in Second Isaiah, where the Servant is described in terms coming from the Moses tradition.² There is however a modification in that the Servant seems

¹ Cf. O. Cullmann, *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments*, Tübingen, 1957, pp. 11-49; H. M. Teeple, *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet*, Philadelphia, 1957; A. S. van der Woude, *Die Messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân*, Assen, 1957, pp. 75-89; R. Schnackenburg, "Die Erwartung des 'Propheten' nach dem Neuen Testament und den Qumran-Texten," *Studia Evangelica* (TU 73), Berlin, 1959, pp. 622-639; F. Hahn, *Christologische Hoheitstitel*, Göttingen, 1963, pp. 351-404; J. Jeremias, art. Μωυσῆς TWNT IV, 852-878; R. Meyer, G. Friedrich, art. προφήτης TWNT, VI, 813-863.

² Cf. A. Bentzen, *Messias-Moses redivivus-Menschensohn*, Zürich, 1948;

to be a collective concept, representing Israel or a group within Israel. The Qumran texts are definitely in the Exodus tradition, and the Dt 18 passage is explicitly quoted as a testimonium to the eschatological prophet, but complicating factors are introduced by the expectation of "the Messiah(s) of Aaron and Israel" and the ascribing of soteriological functions to the community itself. Perhaps more important as a background to the New Testament is the Samaritan expectation of the *Ta'eb*, who is seen not only as the fulfilment of the prophecy of Dt 18 but also has other traits which in the later Rabbinic tradition were associated with the Messiah.¹ Insofar as one can delineate specific traits of the Mosaic eschatological prophet, it can perhaps be said that he would be a worker of miracles and an authoritative expositor of the Torah, that he in common with the other prophets would be anointed by the Holy Spirit for his office and would die a martyr's death, and that he is associated with the covenant and the wilderness. However, it does not seem appropriate to call him a "savior" or "redeemer", and he is at first quite distinct from the concept of Messiah.

Insofar as the new Exodus ends in a new promised land, the Mosaic typology needs to be supplemented by a Joshua typology,² as the one who actually led Israel into Canaan. This would tend to give the prophet like Moses a more military character and would bring the concept closer to that of the Messiah. This would seem to be the case with a number of figures mentioned by Josephus who were neither mere Zealots nor Messianic pretenders. Thus Theudas, who called himself a prophet but was called by Josephus a *ψεύστης* = false prophet (Ant. XX, 97), persuaded a number of people (400 according to Acts 5:36) to follow him to the Jordan, which he

G. von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, Bd. II, München, 1960, pp. 273f. It should be noted that Moses is called servant some 40 times in the O.T., more than any other figure, cf. Zimmerli, *TWNT*, V, 662.

¹ The *Ta'eb* "ist deutlich als Mose redivivus gekennzeichnet und trägt die charakteristischen Züge des Propheten; er tut Wunder, stellt Gesetz und wahren Gottesdienst im Volke wieder her und bringt auch die übrigen Völker zur Erkenntnis." Cullmann, *Christologie*, p. 17.

² It is a shame that Foerster, *TWNT*, III, 292, 32f, let his desire to refute the fantastic theories of Drews lead him to the assertion that "Josua im Spätjudentum nie der Prototyp des Messias" gewesen sei. Justin, Dial 113, clearly refers to a Jewish Christian typology when he says that "as he (Jesus son of Nave), not Moses, led the people into the Holy Land, and as he distributed it by lot to those who entered along with him, so also Jesus the Christ will turn again the dispersion of the people and will distribute the good land to each one."

would command to part. The Egyptian (B.J. II, 261; Ant. XX, 169f; cf. Acts 21:38), who also claimed to be a prophet, went even further, for he persuaded people that from the Mount of Olives he would command the walls of Jerusalem to fall as Joshua did the walls of Jericho, after which he would rule as Messiah (Josephus says "tyrant") in Jerusalem. We also hear in general of γόητες who persuaded people to go out into the desert, where they would show τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα (Ant. XX, 168) or σημεῖα ἐλευθερίας (B.J. II, 259) or σημεῖα καὶ φάσματα (B.J. VII, 438) or σωτηρίαν καὶ πᾶσαν κακῶν (Ant. XX, 188). There does not immediately seem to be a connection with Joshua in the case of the Samaritan of A.D. 36 (Ant. XVIII, 85f), who brought people to Mount Gerizim to recover the sacred vessels which Moses had buried there, but it might be significant that his followers were armed.¹ The later Rabbinic theology was able to assimilate the prophet like Moses to the Davidic Messiah in the phrase "like the first redeemer, so the last redeemer."² But it seems that such an assimilation goes back even further, and that Proto-Luke had antecedents for his identification. We could also refer to Jn 6:14f, where people say that Jesus was "the prophet who comes into the world" and then want to make him king.³ There is then some background which suggests that the Mosaic prophet could be thought of as a political redeemer, a prophet like Joshua, and this conception will be important for our study of Proto-Luke.

We have already discussed Acts 3:13-26 in connection with the *Benedictus* and have seen that Vs 19-21 seem to speak of Jesus as the new Elijah. In view of the connection of part of the early church with the Samaritans,⁴ it is also conceivable that he is being identified with the *Ta'eb* who restores all things, in which case the

¹ According to Samaritan belief the temple on Mt. Gerizim was built by Joshua (J. Macdonald, *The Theology of the Samaritans*, London, 1964, p. 16), and the *Ta'eb* can on occasion be seen in relationship to Joshua (*ibid.*, pp. 35, 368). However, the *Ta'eb* is mainly a Moses redivivus, cf. M. Gaster, *The Samaritans*, London, 1925, pp. 90ff; A. J. Merx, *Der Messiah oder Ta'eb der Samaritaner*, Berlin, 1909; H. Odeberg, *The Fourth Gospel*, Uppsala, 1929, pp. 187ff; and Origen, *contra Celsum*, I, 57, "Dositheus the Samaritan also wished to persuade the Samaritans that he was the Christ predicted by Moses."

² Cf. the passages cited by Jeremias, *TWNT*, IV, 864f.

³ Cf. also Jn 4:19, 25, where for the Samaritan woman prophet and Christ are identical.

⁴ Cf. above, pp. 157ff.

testimonium from Dt 18:15 would follow very naturally. It is however more natural to assume that the reference to Elijah was intended from the very beginning, and then the quotation from Dt 18 acts as a kind of corrective: Jesus is not Elijah but the prophet like Moses. That Jesus is twice called *παῖς* in this speech (3:13, 26) fits in with this same typology, as do the titles *ἅγιος καὶ δίκαιος* (Vs 14) and *ἀρχηγὸς τῆς ζωῆς* (Vs 15). We now have to consider how the title *χριστός* fits into this conception, if indeed it does. J. A. T. Robinson¹ is sure that it does not. Vs 18 (the Christ must suffer) he eliminates as a Lucan addition, and he finds in Vs 19-21 "the most primitive Christology of all," whereby Jesus is called Christ not during his lifetime, not at the resurrection, but only at his parousia. Jesus during his lifetime was only a forerunner of the Christ who was to come, that is of himself, for he was the Christ elect. Although there is no clear indication of it, it is perhaps possible that Robinson has arrived at this view by a misinterpretation of *προεχειρισμένον* as "appoint beforehand (= προ-)".² But the word, which comes from *πρό-χειρος*, "at hand", contains no such temporal element, and should be translated simply as "chosen".³ There is then no indication that Jesus will be called the Christ only at the end, and no need to eliminate Vs 18. Indeed, it is not certain that the passage refers to the parousia at all, for Vs 26 suggests a different interpretation. "God, having raised up his servant, sent him to you first, to bless you in turning every one of you from your wickedness." In line with the quotation of Dt 18:15, it seems at first that "raised up" (*ἀναστήσας*) should be interpreted as "cause to appear on the scene." The more common Christian reference, however, would be to the resurrection, and in fact Jesus during his lifetime did not turn everyone from his wickedness, but instead he was denied and killed (Vs 13-15), because it was foretold by the prophets that the "Anointed" should suffer (Vs 18). As it is now in the preaching of the church that the appeal

¹ "The Most Primitive Christology of All?," *JTS* 7 (1956), 177-189 = *Twelve New Testament Studies*, SBT 34, London, 1962, pp. 139-153.

² E. Haenchen, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 168, does so understand the word (or thinks Luke so misunderstood the word, cf. p. 168, note 5), for he translates "vorausgewählten Messias."

³ Cf. Michaelis, *TWNT*, VI, 865. The passage states that Jesus is the Messiah appointed for Israel, "ohne dass deutlich wird, ob er es mit seiner Parousie oder schon mit seiner Erdenwirksamkeit (Ag 2, 22; 13, 23) oder seit seiner Auferstehung (Ag 3, 13.15) oder von Anfang an ist."

is made to Israel to repent and turn from their wickedness, so it is now that God, having raised up his servant, has sent him to accomplish this. It is difficult to understand the sending in Vs 26 differently from the sending in Vs 19f: "Repent therefore and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out, that times of refreshing may come from the presence of the Lord, and that he may send the Anointed appointed for you, Jesus." God sends Jesus twice, but the reference here seems to be to the second sending in the preaching of the church and not to the parousia. Just because Jesus must be received by heaven until the time of establishing all things (Vs 21), does then not imply an absentee Christology where Jesus has no functions between resurrection and parousia. Even if his presence is through his name (3:6; 2:38; 4:10; 10:43) or the Holy Spirit (2:33; 5:32; 7:51; etc.), nevertheless it is a real presence for Proto-Luke.¹ Jesus is in Acts 3 the "Anointed" both in his death (Vs 18) and in his present work of calling Israel to repentance (Vs 20). As the whole passage concerns the prophet and there is no Messianic reference apart from the title, it is very probable that we should translate *χριστός* in this way, as the anointed prophet. Acts 3 acts then as a bridge between the Mosaic prophet of Acts 7 and the fully Messianic conception of the *Benedictus*. While the two comings of Jesus are characteristic of Proto-Luke, there is no indication here of a difference in titles to designate them, and there is certainly no reservation of the title Christ for Jesus in the parousia. It is then possible to find in Acts 3 a consistent theology,² and Robinson's whole construction breaks down.

The second place where the testimonium Dt 18:15 is explicitly applied to Jesus is in Stephen's speech, as the climax of a whole Moses-Jesus typology (Acts 7:20-39a).³ Moses was a man "mighty in his words and deeds" (Vs 22; cf. Lk 24:19, where Jesus is described as a "prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people."), who when he came to "his brethren the sons of Israel" (Vs 23) sought to help them in their oppression. "He

¹ It may be that differences of interpretation of the words "whom heaven must receive" go back to the Lutheran-Calvinist controversy concerning the location of Christ's risen body in connection with the Lord's Supper.

² Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 145, claims that if one accepts Vs 18 as part of the speech, "then it is difficult on any reconstruction to find in it a consistent theology."

³ On this typology cf. M. Simon, *St. Stephen and the Hellenists in the Primitive Church*, London, 1958, pp. 59-77.

thought the brethren would understand that God through his hand was giving them salvation (σωτηρίαν), but they did not understand" (Vs 25). Moses came to reconcile them to one another "in peace (εἰς εἰρήνην)" (Vs 26), but he was rejected and forced to flee. But forty years later "this Moses whom they rejected . . . God sent as ruler (ἄρχοντα) and savior (λυτρωτήν)" (Vs 35). He performed signs and wonders (τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα) (Vs 36) and received the living oracles (λόγια ζῶντα) (Vs 38) to give Israel. "This is the Moses who said to the sons of Israel: God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among your brethren" (Vs 37). This quotation makes it clear that a Moses-Jesus typology was explicitly intended. We have discussed in another context the anti-cultic dimensions of this speech. As Israel rejected Moses and turned instead to offering sacrifice to the golden calf, so the Israel of Stephen's day has rejected Jesus and preferred instead the sacrifices of the Jerusalem temple. To them will apply therefore the punishment long ago predicted by Amos: exile "beyond Babylon." In the context of the whole speech, the main correspondence between Jesus and Moses is seen to be their rejection by Israel, a conception seemingly typical of Stephen. At the same time other attributes are noted in passing, and they are brought out more positively in some of the other speeches.

If the speeches of the first part of Acts see Jesus in terms of the eschatological prophet like Moses, they also combine this with the conception of Jesus the Messiah. When Jesus is called *παῖς* in Acts 4:27, 30, this can hardly be separated from the same title given to "our father thy servant David" (Vs 25). Also in *Didache* 9-10 Jesus is called servant alongside the designation of David as servant, again characteristically in a prayer. The birth stories also call David God's servant (Lk 1:69), as well as Israel as a whole (1:54). It seems that we cannot use the title "servant" in order to arrive at any specifics of Proto-Lucan Christology, as the reference can vary with the context. We have to look more closely at this context Acts 4, for Jesus is called not only servant (like David) but "holy servant", through whom "signs and wonders" are performed (Vs 30), which again points to the prophetic conception. We are brought back to the problem with which we began in the *Benedictus*, that the conception of Mosaic prophet and Davidic Messiah have coalesced in this Christology.

Acts 4:25f applies to Jesus as the Anointed of the Lord Ps 2:1-2,

and Acts 13:33 quotes Vs 7 of the same psalm. That Jesus should be called Son of God and that Israel has been given "the holy and sure blessings of David" (Is 55:3) is stated specifically to be based on Jesus' resurrection. God did "not let his Holy One see corruption" (Ps 16:10), the same passage that is quoted for Jesus' resurrection in Acts 2:25ff. The same quotations and the same conceptions seem to run through all these speeches. The conclusion of the speech in Acts 2 is this: "therefore let the whole house of Israel know assuredly that God has made him both Lord¹ and Christ." If we seek to determine the meaning of the title not from other associations but from the conceptions found in the speeches themselves, then it seems that "Christ" is equivalent to the "savior from the seed of David whom God has brought for Israel" (Acts 13:23). Apparently the title "Christ" in this view can properly be given to Jesus only after the resurrection, and the reason for this is that only after the resurrection does he begin to function as the prophet like Joshua who leads his people into the promised land. The hymns of the birth stories would then refer more to the risen than to the incarnate Jesus, who should be described more exclusively as the Mosaic prophet. We turn now to the gospel for a closer examination of its Christology of Jesus' earthly life.

After the Messianic proclamation of the birth stories, Proto-Luke in the gospel portrays Jesus almost exclusively as the eschatological prophet like Moses, even to the point of correcting traces of an earlier Elijah typology.² With the possible exception of the baptism story, it is never even suggested that Jesus might be the Messiah. This is surprising after the explicit statements of Lk 1-2, but understandable on the basis of the two-stage Christology taught by Acts.

The baptism and temptation of Jesus are undoubtedly to be seen in connection with the sermon of Nazareth, as all three stories are bound closely together by the motif of the Holy Spirit. This is important when we come to interpret the original form of the voice from heaven. It is conceivable that in Proto-Luke the voice quoted

¹ It is difficult to determine whether this word has been added by Luke to the source. If it is original, then מלך is used in the sense of leader, cf. ἀρχηγός Acts 3:15; 5:31. The title is surely part of the early conception in 10:36.

² The Elijah typology of Luke has been well described by P. Dabek, "Siehe, Es Erschienen Moses und Elias," *Biblica* 23 (1942), 175-189. It is clear that the typology is there, but Dabek fails to note also the corrections.

from the Messianic Psalm 2, "Thou art my son; today have I begotten thee,"¹ the same psalm whose first verses are found in Acts 4:25f. The following temptation story would further define the Son of God as not only the Messiah but also as the representative of Israel in the wilderness, God's first-born son (cf. Ex 4:22). This passage would then be part of the link between the Mosaic prophet and the Davidic Messiah. Two other passages, however, seem to speak rather decisively against this reading. Acts 13:33 quotes Ps 2:7 as having been fulfilled in the resurrection of Jesus, and the similar voice from heaven at the transfiguration (Lk 9:35) by adding the direct quotation of Dt 18:15 speaks clearly of the Mosaic prophet. The voice must then originally have quoted only Is 42:1, "Thou art my servant; in thee I am will pleased."² Also the temptation narrative would originally have read עֶבֶד אֱלֹהִים instead of υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. If the baptism tells of the eschatological prophet receiving the Spirit, this conception is carried out very consistently in the next two stories. The very concept of the Spirit is associated closely with that of the prophet, and the prophetic Christology is brought out by reference to the servant of 2 Is and the typology of Moses. After the crossing of the Red Sea (baptism), comes the forty years of wandering in the wilderness, in which Israel was tempted. Unlike Israel, Jesus does not succumb to temptation, but resists it by quoting significantly three passages from Dt 6-8. After the wandering in the wilderness comes the entry into the promised land, the "acceptable year of the Lord" which is fulfilled "today."

The same Spirit which was given to Jesus in his baptism and which led and sustained him in the temptation was with him when he returned to Galilee (4:15) and entered the synagogue in Nazareth. The passage which he read from Is 61:1 was meant to have programmatic significance and is usually recognized as such: "The Spirit of the Lord is on me, because he has anointed (ἐχρίσεν) me to bring good news to the poor; he has sent me to heal the brokenhearted, to proclaim freedom to the captives and sight again to the blind, to send out the oppressed in freedom, to proclaim

¹ So Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*, ad loc.; Sahlin, *Studien zum dritten Kapitel*, pp. 69ff.

² So Jeremias, *TWNT* V, 699; Cullmann, *Christologie*, p. 65; Hahn, *Hoheitstitel*, p. 340. The second half of the verse, "I will put my spirit on him, and he will bring righteousness to the nations," is also consciously intended, as is shown by the context in which the heavenly voice is heard.

the acceptable year of the Lord" (Lk 4:18f). The reference to the eschatological prophet is plain, not only in the Isaiah context, but even more so in Proto-Luke. Insofar as Jesus proclaims the good news and does mighty acts under the influence of the Holy Spirit, both prophetic tasks, then he has been anointed and can be called *χριστός*. It may be that the very title "proclaimer of good news", was a technical designation of the eschatological prophet,¹ and certainly the task of proclaiming authoritatively the will of God when allied with miraculous works designates this figure. It is quite clearly the eschatological prophet like Moses who is here said to be anointed by the Holy Spirit, and this statement may well be one of the most important reasons why Jesus is later called the Anointed One, *χριστός*, and then Messiah.

It is not sure whether the story in Luke 4 is a unity, or whether after the story of Jesus' self-presentation as the eschatological prophet who was welcomed by his people, Vs 16-22a, there follows a series of sayings concerning Jesus' rejection by his people. However, Jeremias has offered a very strong argument for the unity of the pericope by his translation of Vs 22: "They all witnessed against him, and were indignant at the words of mercy which proceeded from his mouth (because he spoke only of God's mercy and not about his vengeance as in Is 61:2); and they said, 'Is not this the son of Joseph?' " ² When we consider that for Proto-Luke elsewhere the fate of the Mosaic prophet was to be rejection and death (Acts 7:35), then this translation becomes even more probable. There follows the proverb about the prophet not being received in his own country, and the threat that this involved, as seen in the cases of Elijah and Elisha. It should be noted that this is the import of these stories, which have nothing to do with the later Gentile mission. The point is that Elijah did not come to the aid of the widows of Israel during the famine (not that he went to the widow of Zarephath) and that Elisha did not heal any lepers in Israel (not that he healed Naaman). Proto-Luke apparently saw here in the reference to Elijah only an example of the prophet as such, for he would have taken pains to correct an intended Elijah typology, as he does when the story is used typologically in 7:11ff. The pericope ends appropriately with the attempt of Jesus' own people to kill him, again underlining the fact that

¹ Cf. G. Friedrich, *TWNT*, II, 706ff.

² *Jesus' Promise to the Nations* (SBT 24), London, 1958, p. 45.

he shares the fate of all the prophets. Even if the various sayings here combined may at one time have been transmitted separately, in Proto-Luke the pericope is a unity. At the beginning of his gospel, with programmatic intent, Jesus is shown as the Mosaic eschatological prophet, who has been anointed to proclaim God's mercy and to do mighty works, but also to warn Israel that if they do not receive the gospel of mercy they will not benefit from the works. Finally there is an indication that the prophet will not be received but will be killed for the sake of his message.

The Mosaic eschatological prophet shares here the fate of all the prophets, and it can be asked whether Jesus is not often presented simply as one of the prophets with no reference to any eschatological expectation. Cullmann¹ points to those passages where there is no article before the word "prophet". In addition to Mk 6:15; 8:27f par (εἷς τῶν προφητῶν), there are passages in Proto-Luke which seem significant. After the raising of the widow's son at Nain, the crowd "praised God, saying, 'A great prophet has arisen among us'" (7:16), and Simon the Pharisee says that if Jesus had been a prophet he would have known about the character of the woman who anointed him (7:39, cf. the mocking of the crowd 22:64). If these represent the understanding of non-believers, nevertheless perhaps even the Emmaus disciples say that Jesus had been *a* prophet (ἀνὴρ προφήτης 24:19). While this may in fact represent the opinion of some of Jesus' contemporaries, or even that of Jesus himself, it can hardly have been the view of Proto-Luke that Jesus was thought to be "only" a prophet. While in his view Jesus certainly shared the characteristics and the fate of all the prophets, nevertheless as the one who comes proclaiming with authority the coming of the kingdom of God, Jesus is certainly more than an "ordinary prophet." Whatever the original intention, in Proto-Luke the three passages quoted surely have the full Christological weight of *the* eschatological prophet.² This is also true in the case of the proverb Jesus quotes in 4:24 and the examples given of the prophets Elijah and Elisha. While Proto-Luke takes pains to correct the view that Jesus was the prophet like Elijah, as we shall see, there seems to be for him no necessity to correct the view that Jesus was only an ordinary prophet, which evidently was not at issue.

¹ *Christologie*, pp. 29ff.

² Cf. G. Friedrich, *TWNT*, VI, 487.

The story of the raising of the widow's son at Nain (Lk 7:11-17), like the healing of the centurion's slave before it (7:1-10), seems to provide a background for the reply to the question of John the Baptist which follows. The story fits very well into the framework of the Proto-Lucan theology. Just as in Lk 4:16-30, Jesus is seen here as the prophet, and when we heard there that Elijah was sent to a widow in Zarephath, it should not surprise us that the story of this widow in Nain has certain similarities. Elijah raised from the dead the only son of the widow¹ and "gave him to his mother", exactly what is said of Jesus here in 7:15. This verbal correspondence is surely intentional. The story goes on to tell how the crowd "glorified God, saying, 'A great prophet has arisen among us' and 'God has visited his people.'" Jesus is called "great" as in 1:32, and as in 1:68, 78 it is said that in the person of Jesus, God has "visited" his people.

If Jesus is seen as the new Elijah in raising the widow's son at Nain, it is significant that this conception should be immediately corrected in the following material concerning John the Baptist. In the pronouncement story Lk 7:18-23, John asks whether Jesus is he who is to come, i.e. the prophet like Moses.² Those who ask whether or not John recognized this coming one in Jesus, or whether his question indicates a disappointment in him, are illegitimately trying to ask biographical questions of a pronouncement story. The only recognizable purpose of the question of John is to provide a background for Jesus' answer, which by reference to Is 35:5f; 29:18f; 61:1 says in effect that the kingdom of God has come. We also are reminded that there were no deaths or deformities when Israel stood at the foot of Mt. Sinai. Performing miracles and preaching good news to the poor are the task of the eschatological prophet, not of the Messiah. This means that all of the miracle stories, of which we can mention specifically the feeding of the multitude with the new manna in the wilderness, reflect not a Messianic conception³ but also not the Hellenistic θεός ἀνὴρ⁴

¹ 1 Kg 17:17-24; cf. the similar story of Elisha, 2 Kg 4:32-37.

² Cullmann, *Christologie*, pp. 35f, maintains that משיח had become a recognized name for the coming prophet.

³ Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, I, 593ff, and Fiebig, *Jüdische Wundergeschichten des neutestamentlichen Zeitalters unter besonderer Berücksichtigung ihres Verhältnisses zum Neuen Testament*, Tübingen, 1911, p. 72, point out that it is not the task of the Messiah to perform miracles.

⁴ As Bultmann, *syn. Trad.*, p. 256, recognizing that miracles do not fit

but rather a Christology of the eschatological prophet. It is astonishing how in the following sayings about John the Baptist he and Jesus are seen working together as a unity. Jesus says of John that he is a prophet and "more than a prophet" (7:26), indeed that he is the greatest of all who are born of women (Vs 28). The original story may have made just this point, comprising Vs 24b-26, 28a. It was however soon given another point when it says that great as John is, Jesus is greater,¹ which tends to weaken the original assertion.² It is also clear that the testimonium of Vs 27 is a secondary addition, which breaks the natural connection of Vs 26 and 28a. This combination of Ex 23:20 and Mal 3:1 has also been secondarily introduced into the text of Mk 1:2³ and Mt 11:10. Who inserted it into the Lucan context?⁴ I would like to suggest that it was the same person who gave the *Benedictus* to Zechariah and wrote Lk 1:17, namely Proto-Luke, and that he did it in order to counteract the implication of the previous story Lk 7:11-17 that Jesus was Elijah. To go on, Vs 29f were of course not part of Jesus' words about John, but they express very well the Proto-Lucan conception of Jesus and John working together. The people as a whole accepted and were baptized by John (cf. 3:21, "all the people"), just like they accepted Jesus, but John like Jesus was rejected by the Pharisees and lawyers.⁵ The parable of the children in the market place⁶ emphasizes rejection rather than acceptance and is thus in some tension with the foregoing, for here the "men of this generation" do not want to "play" with Jesus and John. One is accused of having a demon, the other of being a drunkard, but both the preacher of the judgment and the preacher of the "acceptable year" are seen together, for "wisdom is justified" in both her children, Jesus and John.

in with the Messianic conception, all too hastily concludes that the miracle stories must be Hellenistic in origin.

¹ "He who is least in the kingdom of God is greater than" John the Baptist, Vs 28b. That the *μικρότερος* refers to Jesus, cf. Cullmann, *Christologie*, p. 31.

² In any case no distinction of eons is intended, a point which must be emphasized over against Conzelmann, *Mitte der Zeit*, pp. 16-21.

³ Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, London, 1963, p. 153, claims that these words were added by a later scribe and were not written by Mark at all.

⁴ T. W. Manson, *Mission and Message*, p. 361, says it was neither Proto-Luke nor Luke but a later scribe.

⁵ That *νομικός* is a specifically Proto-Lucan word, cf. G. D. Kilpatrick, "Scribes, Lawyers, and Lucan Origins," *JTS* 1 (1950), 56-60.

⁶ Cf. J. Jeremias, *Gleichnisse*, pp. 139f.

One of the gaps in Proto-Luke occurs after Lk 8:3, for Proto-Lucan material has been combined with Mark. The story of the curiosity of Herod, Lk 9:7-9, probably belonged to it, for the attitude of Herod is quite different from that of Mk 6:14-16. The story would follow naturally after the mention 8:3 of the wife of Herod's steward, and Herod's desire to see Jesus prepares for 23:8. The transfiguration, Lk 9:28-36, was in any case an important part of Proto-Luke,¹ even if the presence of Markan material makes it difficult to reconstruct it. It is probable that also the Markan story is intended to present Jesus as the new Moses, as is shown by the many typological references to Ex 24: the six days, the presence of three followers with Moses/Jesus, the mountain top, the voice of God speaking from the midst of a cloud. If so, then the places where Luke diverges from Mark only underline this same typology. That the appearance of Jesus' face was altered corresponds to Ex 35:29, Moses on Mt. Sinai. The two men probably were not identified in Proto-Luke as Moses and Elijah but were meant to correspond with the two men at the resurrection (24:4) and the ascension (Acts 1:10). They spoke about "the ἔξοδος which Jesus was going to accomplish in Jerusalem" (9:31). J. Mánek² sees in this a central theme of the theology of Luke: Jerusalem is seen as Egypt (cf. Rev 11:8), Jesus' death as the crossing of the Red Sea (his baptism, cf. 1 Cor 10:2; Lk 12:50; Mk 10:38), the forty days with his disciples as the forty years wandering in the wilderness, and his ascension as the entry into the promised land. However this may be, the voice from heaven clearly designates Jesus as the new Moses when it quotes from Dt 18:15 "listen to him." The word "chosen", rather than "beloved", also indicates Is 42:1, which means that the υἱός was originally the עֶבֶד, the prophet like Moses. This central story is very important for the Christology of Proto-Luke.

"It happened when the days of his ascension were filled up that he set his face to go to Jerusalem." Both the strongly Semitic and the programmatic character of the section Lk 9:51-56 have long attracted attention. Coming just after the Proto-Lucan transfiguration story, ἀνάλημψις has the same fullness of meaning

¹ Cf. Easton, *Luke*, p. 145; Grundmann, *Lukas*, p. 191. Taylor, *Third Gospel*, ad loc., supposes "other sources" have been used besides Mark without specifying Proto-Luke.

² "The New Exodus in the Books of Luke," *NT* 2 (1958), 8-23.

here as did ἔξοδος there. C. F. Evans¹ suggests that the *Assumptio Mosis* was already known to the author, who therefore includes in the word not only death and passage to heaven but also the "series of addresses and injunctions (which Moses) delivered in Amman beyond Jordan to his successor whom he is leaving behind." This leads Evans not only to suppose a connection between the messengers sent ahead of Jesus (Vs 51) and the sending of the twelve spies into Canaan (Dt 1:22ff), but he also presents a good case for the whole of Luke's central section 9:51-18:14 being a conscious parallel to the book of Deuteronomy. His list of correspondences is impressive, and one can only say that if this was not the organizing principle of the whole section, then at least the individual typologies have a cumulative value in demonstrating the Proto-Lucan conception of Jesus as the new Moses.

Of course the idea of an ascension to heaven is even more relevant to the Elijah tradition than to that of Moses, and it may be that it was originally meant in this sense. This would explain the following anti-Elijah polemic of Proto-Luke. When the people of a Samaritan village would not receive Jesus because he was going to Jerusalem, James and John want to let "fire come down from heaven and consume them" (9:54), a verbatim reference to the Elijah story 2 Kg 1:10, 12. The later addition "as Elijah did" only makes explicit what was already clearly intended, and the whole point of the story is Jesus' rebuke of his followers who want to see him in the role of Elijah. The three sayings on discipleship have been included here for the same reason, for the third (9:61f) also provides a contrast to the Elijah story 1 Kg 19:19-21. When Elijah called Elisha to be his disciple, the latter, who was plowing, asked permission first to say farewell to his parents. Jesus however does not give this permission, in contrast to Elijah, and the proverb about putting one's hand to the plow was perhaps also suggested by the Elijah story.

A reference to Elijah together with a rejection of this role is to be found also in Lk 12:49-53, "I have come to cast fire on the earth, and would that² it were kindled already." This is hardly the "role of Elijah", as Robinson says,³ for although Elijah in 2 Kg 1 calls

¹ "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel," *Studies in the Gospels*, ed. D. E. Nineham, Oxford, 1955, pp. 37-53, p. 40.

² τὶ θελω is a Semitism, cf. Is 9:5; 2 Sm 6:20; Sir 23:14.

³ "Elijah, John and Jesus," *NTS* 4 (1958), 263-281 = *Twelve New*

down fire from heaven, the function of the messenger in Mal 3:1 is to warn Israel *before* the coming fire of judgment. Jesus, on the other hand, not only preaches the judgment, but his coming in a sense is this judgment; it is for the "fall or rising of many in Israel" (Lk 2:34). For Jesus himself this will result in his baptism of death (Vs 50) and for Israel in a division (cf. 2:35, "through your soul will a sword pierce, so that revealed are the thoughts of many hearts"): "You think that I have come to give peace on earth; no, I tell you, but rather division" (Vs 51). Here there is a clear rejection of the role of Elijah, who was to "turn the hearts of fathers to their sons and the hearts of sons to their fathers" (Mal 3:24; cf. Sir 48:10). Rather than uniting families, the result of Jesus' mission will be to divide them, "father against son and son against father" (Vs 53). Here is not only a rejection of the role of Elijah, but also of Jesus' own task of "guiding the feet of Israel in the way of peace" (1:79). This passage will be discussed further in that connection.

There are a number of other stories where in a more incidental way Jesus is seen typologically as the prophet like Moses. Thus in Lk 12:13-15 when someone asks Jesus to decide the respective rights of two brothers in an inheritance case, he replies, "man, who made me a judge or divider over you," recalling the taunt to Moses Ex 2:14, "who made you a prince and judge over us?" In Lk 11:20 Jesus drives out demons "by the finger of God" (the parallel in Mt reads "by the Spirit of God"), a rather strange way of speaking which can be due only to the identical characterization of the source of Moses' miracles Ex 8:15. When Jesus sends out 70 (or 72) disciples Lk 10:1, a correspondence to the 70 elders with Moses on Mt. Sinai (Ex 24:1; Num 11:16) is very likely intended.¹

A passage which is extremely important in understanding the conception of Jesus as the eschatological prophet, one which probably accurately reflects even Jesus' own conception of his mission, is found in Lk 13:31-33 and 34-35. In reply to that fox Herod, Jesus says that he must go to Jerusalem, "for it is impossible

Testament Studies, pp. 28-52, p. 43. He wants to translate "But what do I care if it is now kindled," i.e. that is what John the Baptist expects of me, but I have a different work to accomplish. But Robinson's interesting essay is vitiated by much too speculative biographical interest in the relationship of Jesus and John the Baptist.

¹ This is more probable than the frequently mentioned reference to the 70 (72) nations of Gen 10; cf. below pp. 318.

that a prophet should perish outside Jerusalem." In the next saying the city is addressed as "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, who kills the prophets and stones your messengers . . ." To these two sayings of Jesus we can add a third already mentioned: "no prophet is received in his own country" (4:24). Here Jesus clearly ranks himself among the prophets insofar as in the first century understanding the role of a prophet involved rejection and a martyr's death.¹ What is true of the prophets in general is of course also true of the eschatological prophet, so that there is here no contradiction to the Proto-Lucan conception of the prophet like Moses. On the contrary, here is undoubtedly one of the main reasons for the church's use of this category to describe Jesus.

Finally Lk 24 brings us back to our starting point, the combination of the conception of the prophet and the title of Christ. In the story of the two disciples on the road to Emmaus, 24:13-35, they say of Jesus of Nazareth that he was a man who "became a prophet, mighty in deed and word, before God and all the people" (Vs 19). There is no indication that this is only the characterization of the two disciples, for it sums up what Proto-Luke has been saying throughout the gospel (cf. also Acts 2:22; 7:22). Jesus has not only demonstrated through his works and his teaching that he is truly the Mosaic prophet before God, but he is specifically the prophet sent to "all the people," i.e. Israel. This prophet has been delivered up to death by the high priests and the leaders of Israel, and now the hopes of his followers have been frustrated. "But we had hoped that he was the one who is going to redeem (λυτροῦσθαι) Israel" (Vs 21). This statement is usually interpreted in a negative sense. The disciples had falsely seen in Jesus a national liberator like one of the Zealots instead of recognizing him as he really was. They are therefore called "foolish and slow of heart to believe" (Vs 25), namely that Jesus is the spiritual savior of all the world, teaching which must now be imparted to them before they can be true witnesses. However, this means to read the passage in the light of later theology instead of in its own context of a gospel which began with the birth stories. There is there no suggestion that Anna was deluded when she spoke of Jesus "to all who were awaiting the redemption (λῶτρῳσιν) of Jerusalem"

¹ Cf. H. A. Fischel, "Prophet and Martyr," *JQR* 37 (1946-47), 265-280, 363-386; H. J. Schoeps, "Die jüdischen Prophetenmorde," *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit*, Tübingen, 1950, pp. 126-143.

(2:38), or that the *Benedictus* was wrong to praise God, who in the coming of Jesus had "visited and given redemption (λύτρωσιν) to his people" (1:68). When Acts 7:35 says that God made Moses "a leader and redeemer (λυτρωτήν)" of Israel, it is implied that these titles apply as well to Jesus. In this context there is nothing wrong with the hope of the disciples at all, and they are called foolish and slow to believe not because of the content of this hope but because they had given it up and spoke of Jesus in the past tense.¹ Accordingly, Jesus the prophet was still the one who is going to redeem Israel.

The Emmaus disciples are called foolish not because of the content of their hope but because they were "slow of heart to believe everything which the prophets had spoken." But, says the risen Jesus, not yet recognized, "was not this necessary, that the Christos should suffer and enter into his glory? And beginning with Moses and with all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the writings² the things concerning himself" (Vs 25-27). The disciples are faulted not for hoping for the redemption of Israel but for not believing the prophets who had announced beforehand the death and resurrection of Jesus, so that they should not have allowed their hopes to falter. It is of course notorious that nowhere is it even intimated that the Messiah should suffer, neither in the Bible as written nor in the Bible as read in first century Judaism. The phrase is peculiar to the Lucan writings, and it is customary to ascribe it to the ignorance of Luke, who has promiscuously given the title of Messiah to the function of the Isaianic servant. It would however be more honest to the text to inquire first about the (Proto-) Lucan conception of the Christ, to see whether or not it can be appropriately said that he will suffer. Indeed, we could even take this passage as part of the definition of the term: for Proto-Luke "Christos" means him about whom all the scriptures speak, saying that he must first suffer and then enter into his glory.

¹ Similarly the phrase in Acts 1:6, "Lord, will you at this time restore the kingdom to Israel," should not, as usually happens, be ascribed only to the ignorance of the disciples which had not yet been overcome, but it should be taken seriously as the expression of the theology of the author; cf. below, pp. 301.

² The text of Luke seems to separate the γράφαι as a general term from Moses and the prophets, but the resemblance to the three parts of the Hebrew canon is so close that Proto-Luke must have said: "From Moses and all the prophets and all the writings . . ." Cf. Vs 44.

The pattern of suffering and exaltation is well known in all the scriptures when it refers to Israel as a people (Cf. 2 Is as a whole but also Hos 5:8-6:3; Dn 7; etc.) but it was thought to be especially applicable to the prophets, to Moses, and to the Isaianic servant. All that we have found throughout the gospel in connection with the eschatological prophet is here summed up as being said of the Christos.¹

In conclusion, we can describe the Christology of Proto-Luke as a combination of the Mosaic prophet with the Davidic Messiah. Both conceptions are definitely political, and the combination can be made because Proto-Luke sees the function of both to be that of savior of Israel. The following recapitulation will attempt to show how such a development could take place.

It is possible that Jesus was understood by some of his contemporaries, perhaps even by himself, in terms of the general category of prophet,² but for his later followers he was rather the eschatological prophet.³ We have found a number of indications that certain groups of the early church saw in Jesus the fulfillment of the promise of a returning Elijah. This conception was in every case corrected by Proto-Luke to make Jesus rather the eschatological prophet like Moses. This is brought out not only by emphasizing Jesus' activity as proclaimer of the good news of God's eschatological mercy and as a worker of miracles, but also by a number of specific titles. The *locus classicus* Dt 18:15ff is quoted three times (Lk 9:35; Acts 3:22; 7:37), and the Mosaic prophet is called

¹ The second appearance in Lk 24:36-49 seems to be a later story, but there is no reason to call it Hellenistic (Bultmann, *syn. Trad.*, p. 313) or deny it to Proto-Luke. The anti-Docetism involved in the description of Jesus eating fish and being touched could very well have seemed necessary in a Jerusalem church which wanted to emphasize the Hebraic conception of resurrection over against the tendency of some (Cf. 1 Cor 15) to spiritualize it. For the rest, the words of the risen Christ only repeat what was said in the earlier story, with the added statement that Israel's mission to the nations is contained in the scriptures. This will be discussed below, pp. 300.

² On Jesus as a prophet, cf. C. H. Dodd, "Jesus als Lehrer und Prophet," in *Mysterium Christi*, ed. Bell and Deissmann, London, 1930, pp. 56-66; F. Gils, *Jésus prophète d'après les Évangiles synoptiques*, Louvain, 1957; G. Friedrich, *TWNT*, VI, 842-849; O. Cullmann, *Christologie*, pp. 29-37.

³ K. Bornhäuser, *Das Wirken des Christus durch Taten und Worte*, Gütersloh, 1921, tried to show that Jesus thought himself to be the Mosaic prophet during his lifetime and expected to be the Messiah at the parousia (resurrection?). Although many of the details of his exposition cannot be defended, Bornhäuser has in his main thesis delineated the Christology not of course of Jesus but of Proto-Luke. Cf. also his *Studien zum Sondergut des Lukas*, 1934.

specifically ἀρχηγός (Acts 3:15; 5:31), λυτρωτής (Acts 7:35), and σωτήρ (Lk 2:11; Acts 5:31; 13:24). Probably also the titles ὁ δίκαιος (Lk 23:47; Acts 3:14; 7:52), ὁ παῖς (Acts 3:13, 26; 4:27, 30), and ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ (Lk 1:35; Acts 3:14; 4:27; cf. Mk 1:24; Jn 6:69) refer to the same figure. It is important to note that beyond Jesus' teaching and miracles also his death is an important part of this conception, for "it cannot be that a prophet should perish outside Jerusalem" (Lk 13:33). In this view (cf. Acts 7:23ff) Jesus fulfilled the role of the Mosaic prophet not only in bringing to Israel deliverance and the offer of peace but also in being rejected by them; the prophet like Moses is seen through the interpretation given to him by the suffering servant of Second Isaiah, even though there is no sign of a vicarious atonement effected by Jesus' death.

It has often been remarked that Luke has no doctrine of the atonement;¹ nevertheless this does not mean that Jesus' death is of no importance for him. When it is stated again and again that it was necessary that he should suffer, this does not mean a mechanical fulfilment of the scriptures. By dying Jesus fulfills the fate of all the prophets, but his and their death is of importance not in itself but as the inevitable conclusion of their lives. Jesus' death is a seal of the fact that he was truly a prophet, even the prophet, and thereby the truth of his proclamation of the kingdom of God. Jesus' death at the hands of Israel is the result of his great concern for Israel, and it represents the climax of his intercession for Israel. In this connection, the words from the cross, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," (Lk 23:34) are of great significance. It is only at the end of his life that Jesus can truly be said to have been the eschatological prophet like Moses.

We have learned from Conzelmann to make a sharp distinction in the theology of Luke between the time of Jesus and the time of the church; this distinction holds also for Proto-Luke. Jesus' first coming, in which he proclaimed by word and deed the acceptable year of the Lord and threatened the judgment which would result from a refusal of the mercy of God, ended as it had to, in his death. But whereas his first coming ended in failure, his second coming,

¹ "There is indeed no *theologia crucis* beyond the affirmation that the Christ must suffer, since so the prophetic scriptures had foretold," Creed, *Luke*, p. lxxiii. "Die wichtigste Feststellung (ist) die, dass weder von einer Pasionismystik etwas zu bemerken ist noch eine direkte Heilsbedeutung des Leidens oder Sterbens ausgeführt wird. Eine Beziehung zur Sündenvergebung ist nicht hergestellt," Conzelmann, *Mitte der Zeit*, p. 187.

when on the basis of the resurrection the same gospel and threat are proclaimed by the church, will in the eyes of Proto-Luke be successful. Jesus' role as eschatological prophet was sealed by his death and legitimized by his resurrection, and now he acquires also the role of Joshua who will lead Israel into the promised land. It must be emphasized against Conzelmann that the time of the church does not mean the absence of Jesus but rather his presence in a new way.

If it is the prophet like Moses who proclaims salvation, then it is the prophet like Joshua who actualizes this salvation. It is because Jesus the eschatological prophet can be called savior that he is also called the Messiah. Since it is clear that Jesus during his lifetime consistently refused the title of Messiah,¹ and that the title in fact is inappropriate to define the reality the church experienced, it is very difficult to determine why the title Christ should have become so common in the church as to be used as a proper name. N. A. Dahl² has suggested that the title was accepted somewhat ironically because this was in fact the crime for which Jesus was innocently executed. This would explain the frequent use of the title in the passion story and also why it should have been associated with Jesus' death.³ To be really plausible, this theory needs the more complementary than alternative explanation of van Unnik,⁴ who sees the root of the title in the citation of Is 61:1 in Lk 4:18. Not only the eschatological king, but also the prophet can be said to be anointed.⁵ Three times in prophetic contexts Jesus is said to be anointed: Lk 4:18, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor"; Acts 10:38, "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power"; and Acts 4:27, "... thy holy servant Jesus, whom thou didst anoint." Nevertheless, even though Jesus as the Mosaic prophet could be said to have been anointed, he is not called the Anointed One (משיח, χριστός) until after the resurrection (Acts

¹ Cf. E. Stauffer, "Messias oder Menschensohn," *NT* 1 (1956), 81-102; O. Cullmann, *Christologie*, pp. 117-128.

² "Der gekreuzigte Messias," *Der historische Jesus und der kerygmatische Christus*, ed. Ristow and Matthiae, Berlin, 1962, pp. 149-169.

³ During Jesus' lifetime the title is used only in the passion story as an accusation or taunt, Lk 22:67; 23:2, 35, 39.

⁴ W. C. van Unnik, "Jesus the Christ," *NTS* 8 (1961-62), 101-116.

⁵ Cf. 1 Kg 19:16; Is 61:1; CD VI:1; 1QM XI:7. On the latter cf. A. S. van der Woude, *Die Messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran*, Assen, 1958, pp. 20ff, 117ff.

2:31, 36; 3:20; 13:33f). Only when Jesus enters his role of the prophet like Joshua can he properly be called Christ as a savior figure, and then the anointed prophet from the seed of David can be assimilated to the Anointed of the Lord, the Davidic Messiah. Of course the fact that Jesus is called the Messiah on the basis of the resurrection underlines the significance of his being anointed as eschatological prophet and of his dying because of the accusation of being the Messiah. Very early the title Christ was applied to Jesus as the one who both died and was raised. W. Kramer¹ has demonstrated in some detail that this was the pre-Pauline usage, and among other texts 1 Cor 15:3 ("Christ died . . . was raised") shows the Palestinian origin of the title in this sense. The characteristic Lucan phrase is that it was necessary for the Christ to suffer many things and enter into his glory (Lk 24:26, 46; Acts 3:18), and the birth stories can speak of the significance of Jesus' total career by calling him both Mosaic prophet and Davidic Messiah (Lk 2:11, 26).

The Christology of Proto-Luke involves two stages, the first coming of Jesus as Mosaic prophet and his "second coming" as the prophet like Joshua and Messiah. The transition between the two is Jesus' death-resurrection-ascension. This runs directly counter to the thesis of F. Hahn, who says that the Palestinian church had a two-pole Christology² focussing on Jesus' life and parousia, whereby exaltation is a distinctly Hellenistic conception. On the other side, E. Schweizer³ has argued strongly for a humiliation-exaltation pattern as the most primitive one, and our study of Proto-Luke seems to support this. It is significant that in spite of the extensive eschatological teaching of Proto-Luke, there is no saying regarding the parousia as such, and that while the end can be seen as a consummation it has no direct relevance to Christology. The significant event for Proto-Luke is the ἀνάληψις of Jesus (Lk 9:51), the ἔξοδος which he was to accomplish at Jerusalem (9:31). The saying before the High Priest makes no reference to Dn 7 but says rather that "from now on the Son of Man shall be seated at the right hand of the power" (22:69). Finally, the Proto-Lucan Christology is summarized in succinct form in the statement

¹ W. Kramer, *Christos, Kyrios, Gottessohn*, Zürich, 1963, § 2-14.

² *Christologische Hoheitstitel*, Göttingen, 1963.

³ *Erniedrigung und Erhöhung bei Jesus und seinen Nachfolger*, Zürich, 1955.

that "the Christ should suffer and enter into his glory" (24:26). As has often been noted, this results in a kind of absentee Christology with Jesus in heaven and his church on earth, but this is compensated for not by reference to a future parousia but through an extensive development of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Salvation for Proto-Luke is neither a past achievement nor only a future hope but is rather something to which the risen Christ through the Holy Spirit is presently leading his people.

The concept of Jesus as savior and redeemer, far from being influenced by the Hellenistic world, is that concept which enables Proto-Luke to make the transition from Mosaic prophet to Davidic Messiah. The same is true of the Rabbinic *rapprochement* of the two as seen in the saying, "as the first redeemer (Moses) so the last redeemer (Messiah)." That the concept redeemer can be applied to both seems to have been mediated through the Joshua tradition. "Joshua the son of Nun was mighty in war and was the successor of Moses in prophesying. He became, in accordance with his name, a great savior (μέγας ἐπὶ σωτηρία) of God's elect."¹ The specific Proto-Lucan conception of the savior can perhaps best be brought out by a simple listing of all passages where σωτήρ, σωτηρία, and the stem λυτρο- appear:

- Lk 1:47 my spirit rejoices in the God of my *salvation* (God my *savior*)
 1:68f (God) has visited and given *redemption* to his people, and has raised up for us a horn of *salvation*
 1:71 *salvation* from our enemies and from the hand of all who hate us
 1:77 to give knowledge of *salvation* to his people
 2:10f great joy for the whole people; for to you is born today a *savior* who is the Messiah of the Lord in the city of David
 2:30 my eyes have seen thy *salvation* . . . glory for thy people Israel
 2:38 all who were looking for the *redemption* of Israel
 3:6 "all flesh shall see the *salvation* of God" (Is 40:5)
 19:9 today *salvation* has come to this house, since he also is a son of Abraham
 24:21 (Jesus) is the one who is going to *redeem* Israel
 Ac 4:12 there is *salvation* in no one else (than the rejected stone Jesus)
 5:31 God exalted him at his right hand as leader and *savior*, to give repentance to Israel
 7:25 God was giving them (Israel) *salvation* by his (Moses') hand
 7:35 this Moses . . . God sent as both ruler and *deliverer*

¹ Sir 46:1. The importance of this text has been pointed out by Hahn, op. cit., p. 360.

13:26 brethren, sons of the family of Abraham and those among you who fear God, to us has been sent the message of this *salvation*

It is this concept, which goes beyond the eschatological prophet like Moses, which leads Proto-Luke to combine it with the prophet like Joshua and the Davidic Messiah. The concept is so closely associated with Israel as the people of God that one could almost call it nationalistic. It is the relationship between the prophet-Messiah and the salvation he brings to Israel which must now be discussed.

4. JESUS AND ISRAEL

We saw that the birth stories were addressed exclusively to the situation of Israel. This would be appropriate only if these chapters represented the proclamation of a church preaching primarily to Israel. We know that there was such a church; the only question is whether Proto-Luke could conceivably contain the preaching tradition of this church, which would provide a fitting context for predictions of the destruction of Jerusalem. We shall turn first to the early chapters of Acts before examining the attitude of the gospel to Israel.

The greatest crisis the early church faced was not the so-called problem of the delay of the parousia but the fact that Israel as a whole did not respond to the gospel and that thus the fulfilment of the promises seemed endangered.¹ As far as we can tell this crisis first became acute during the reign of Herod Agrippa (A.D. 40-44), when for the first time Pharisees, allied with the Herodians, joined in the persecution of the church.² By the time Paul visited Jerusalem (Gal 1:18) only Peter was present of the Twelve, and at the council of Jerusalem (Gal 2:1-10) the direction of the Jerusalem church was in the hands of James, while Peter and the Twelve were engaged in missionary activity to the Jews (Gal 2:7) outside the city. While the council resulted in the recognition by Jerusalem

¹ Rm 10:16, 21 shows the problem: "they have not all heeded the gospel" and "all day long I have held out my hands to a disobedient and contrary people", and Rm 9-11 as a whole shows Paul's solution to the problem; cf. J. Munck, *Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte*, pp. 204ff and *Christus und Israel*, Aarhus, 1956, pp. 70ff.

² Cf. B. Reicke, "Der geschichtliche Hintergrund des Apostelkonzils und der Antiochia-Episode Gal 2, 1-14," *Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan*, Haarlem, 1953, pp. 172-187; and *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte* Berlin, 1965, p. 148f.

of the legitimacy of Paul's mission, at the same time they did not give up their own conviction that the true mission of the church lay in concentrating on preaching to Israel. It should be emphasized that there was no objection in Jerusalem to the Gentiles as such, but that it was their conviction that the way to the salvation of the Gentiles was through the preaching of this salvation first to Israel. In this task they continued until the martyrdom of James and the Roman war destroyed almost completely the work of the first generation of the church in Israel. What form did the preaching of this church take? We have no direct record at all, but only the evidence of the early chapters of Acts and, as I shall try to show, of the Proto-Lucan portions of the gospel.

It is of course not possible after the work of the past generation to take Acts 1-15 as a first-hand account of the Jerusalem church, but for our purposes we can perhaps use these chapters for a rough approximation of the attitude of this church to Israel. Our primary concern will be of course with the speeches, where this attitude is most clearly expressed. As we are seeking only to sketch a background for Proto-Luke in the gospel, perhaps the task of distinguishing between conceptions of Luke and the earlier tradition can be spared us here. It may be sufficient to say that I would not disagree in principle with the conclusion of Wilckens, "Im jetzigen Zusammenhang der Apostelgeschichte sind die Reden gerade auch in ihrer Form, in dem zugrunde gelegten Schema, durchgehend von der theologischen Gesamtkonzeption des Lukas her verständlich."¹ However, I do disagree with the implication that they are *only* understandable from Luke's conception and that this conception must have been peculiar to him and radically different from that of earlier times.

Although it may be naive to make the suggestion, let us just look at the addresses of the speeches: Acts 2: "Men of Israel and all who dwell in Jerusalem, let this be known to you and give ear to my words . . . Men of Israel, hear these words . . . Brethren, I may say to you . . . Let all the house of Israel . . . know assuredly" (Vs 14, 22, 29, 36). Acts 3: "Men of Israel, why do you wonder at this? . . . And now, brethren" (Vs 12, 17). Acts 4: "Rulers of the people and elders . . . be it known to you all and to all the people of Israel" (Vs 8-10). Acts 7: "Brethren and fathers . . . you stiff-

¹ U. Wilckens, *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte*, Neukirchen, 1961, p. 99.

necked people, uncircumcized in heart and ears" (Vs 2, 51). Acts 13: "Men of Israel, and you that fear God, listen . . . Brethren, sons of the family of Abraham and those among you who fear God . . . Let it be known to you therefore brethren" (Vs 16, 26, 38). It is of course possible that Luke has written the speeches to conform to his understanding of the historical situation of the Jerusalem church, but when we see that also the content of the speeches applies primarily to Israel, it is difficult to imagine that they are only a later recreation or that Luke would have had any motive for writing them did they not in fact contain an authentic earlier tradition.

Luke 24 ends with the risen Christ opening the minds of his followers to understand the scriptures: "Thus it is written, that the Christ would suffer and rise from the dead on the third day, and that repentance leading toward forgiveness of sins would be preached in his name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem. You are witnesses of all this. And behold I send the promise of my father on you. But stay in the city until you are clothed with power from on high" (Lk 24:46-49). Even without trying to distinguish between Palestinian and later Hellenistic conceptions, two questions immediately present themselves. Not only the death and resurrection of the Christ (Cf. 1 Cor 15:3ff) but also the mission to the Gentiles is said to be contained in the scriptures. This is not only an extremely important conception for understanding the Gentile mission in Acts, as is brought out in an important article by J. Jervell,¹ but it is also in accord with Proto-Luke in the gospel and presumably with the view of the Jerusalem church. Second, there is the question of the "promise of the father." The next sentence might lead one to interpret the promise as the gift of the Holy Spirit, and in fact Acts 2:33 does so interpret it. However, in Acts 2:39 and 13:23 the promise is broader, referring to the salvation brought to Israel, and in fact the disciples do not wait

¹ "Das gespaltene Israel und die Heidenvölker. Zur Motivierung der Heidenmission in der Apostelgeschichte," *Stud. Theol.* 19 (1965), 68-96. He makes three points: 1. Acts does not present an Israel which as a whole has rejected the gospel but an Israel divided by the preaching of the church into a repentant and an unrepentant group; 2. the church is not called the *tertium genus* in Acts, and the name Israel always refers to the Jewish people; and 3. it is Israel's acceptance (not rejection) of the gospel which is a presupposition for the mission to the Gentiles in Acts. Of course these conclusions apply with even greater force to that early part of Acts connected with Proto-Luke.

in Jerusalem only for the gift of the Holy Spirit but continue staying there after Pentecost. In the context of Proto-Luke the promise seems to be the same as the "consolation of Israel" (Lk 2:25), the "redemption of Jerusalem" (2:38), the "salvation prepared in the presence of all peoples" which would be "a light for revelation to the nations," but also "glory for thy people Israel" (2:30-32). If Acts 1:6f then once followed as the reply of the disciples to this announcement, their question is seen in a positive light: "Lord, will you at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" Jesus' reply indicates that the disciples should not know the time but says nothing whatever about not restoring the kingdom to Israel, which on the contrary seems to be exactly his promise.¹

The first chapters of Acts show the Galilean disciples and the early church exclusively in Jerusalem. Why? It is not enough to point to the role of Jerusalem in the *heilsgeschichtliche* conception of Luke as forming the bridge between the time of Jesus and the time of the church, because no one doubts that in fact they stayed there. Not only was it not the natural thing to do in the circumstances, but it was possible for these Galileans to live there only at the cost of great economic hardship, which had to met by the sharing of what property they had and even had to be supplemented from outside. B. Sundkler² suggested in 1937 an answer to this question which has since been widely accepted. It was because of the consciousness of the early church that they were living in the last times that they concentrated their preaching in the centre of Israel, Jerusalem, and it was precisely for the sake of this salvation becoming "a light for revelation to the Gentiles." In the end times the Gentiles will come to Jerusalem for salvation, "for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of Yahweh from Jerusalem" (Is 2:3 = Mic 4:2).

This concept of mission centered on Israel is precisely what we find in the speeches of Acts, a strong argument for their containing early material. Whatever the origin of the list of peoples who were present in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, and whatever the later understanding of their significance, in the present text they

¹ Acts 1:8, almost a table of contents for the book of Acts (Jerusalem, Judea, Samaria, end of the earth = Rome) is of course an addition by Luke to his source.

² "Jésus et les païens," *Arbeiten und Mitteilungen aus dem neutestamentlichen Seminar zu Uppsala* VI, Uppsala, 1937, pp. 1-38.

are plainly called "Jews, devout men from every nation under heaven" (2:5). Peter's speech is also clearly addressed to Israel. His hearers are told that they are the ones who "crucified and killed by the hands of lawless men . . . this Jesus whom God raised up" (2:23, 32). When they ask what they should do, Peter tells them to "repent and be baptized . . . For yours is the promise and it is for your children and for all who are far off, whomever the Lord our God shall call" (2:38f). It is probable that already in the original source the Gentiles and not just the Diaspora are meant by "all who are far off" (cf. Is 57:19; Eph 2:13, 17). Nevertheless, the promise is first and primarily to Israel, even if this Israel is characterized as a "crooked generation" from which the hearers are urged to save themselves (2:40).

We have already discussed the speech in Acts 3 from the standpoint of its Christology. Here it is enough to mention that God is called "the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, the God of our fathers" (3:13), and the hearers are called "the sons of the prophets and of the covenant which God gave to our fathers" (3:25). This covenant is further characterized not as that of Sinai but as that given to Abraham, when God promised: "in your seed shall be blessed all the families of the earth" (3:25). The *σπέρμα* is to be interpreted in this context as referring not to Jesus¹ but to Israel.² This is in accordance with the usage of Proto-Luke (Lk 1:55; 13:16; 19:9; cf. Acts 7:5f; 13:16) and alone makes sense of the passage. "Having raised up his servant, God sent him to you first" (3:26). Jesus was sent to Israel first in fulfillment of the promise to Abraham, that in the salvation of Israel also the Gentiles would be included. The promise is first to Israel, and therefore Israel is called to repentance, for God sent Jesus "to bless you by turning every one of you from your wickedness" (3:26). If Israel does not repent, then "it will be that every soul which does not listen to that prophet shall be cut off from the people" (3:23 quoting Dt 18:19). Again, salvation is for Israel and therefore also for the Gentiles, and Israel is called to repentance.

The motif of calling Israel to repentance is a common one in these speeches. We can cite in addition to those passages already quoted (Acts 2:38; 3:19a, 26) also the short speech in Acts 5: "this leader

¹ So Haenchen, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 169.

² N. A. Dahl, "'A People for His Name' (Acts xv 14)," *NTS* 4 (1957-58), 319-327; J. Jervell, art. cit., p. 86f.

and savior God exalted at his right hand, to give repentance to Israel and the forgiveness of sins" (5:31). It might perhaps seem strange that the conclusion to the kerygma should be the exhortation not to rejoice but to repent. In this the early church places itself in a position analogous to that of John the Baptist. John said in effect: the judgment is near, therefore repent. The Jerusalem church also said in effect: now that Jesus has come and the Holy Spirit has been given, this is truly the last age; the judgment is even nearer, therefore repent. The prophecy from Joel which introduces Peter's Pentecost speech immediately after the promise of the Spirit on all flesh mentions signs and wonders and the coming of "the great and manifest day of the Lord" (2:20). It is also probable that the early church, gathered in Jerusalem, was very much aware of the Elijah text Mal 3:1, "the Lord whom you seek will suddenly come to his temple." It is therefore no wonder that the church should renew John's message, and perhaps something else besides. It has long been a problem why when Jesus did not baptize the early church began doing so as it seems from the very beginning. Part of the answer may lie in this similarity of their situation to that of the Baptist, which led them to continue his practice. John was then for them not just a figure of the past but one whose message and baptism was still very relevant to the present.

The arrest of Peter and John contains a remarkable feature whose significance seems not to have been appreciated: the testimony of the Pharisee Gamaliel to the young church. These early chapters emphasize strongly the popular position of the disciples. They "had the favor (*χάρις*) of all the people" (2:47), "the people extolled them" (5:13), and perhaps "great favor (*χάρις*) (from the people?) was on all of them" (4:33). To this we can add the reports of ever-increasing numbers of converts: 3000 (2:41), 5000 (4:4), "multitudes more than ever" (5:14). On the other hand the enemies of the disciples are also clearly named: "the priests and the captain of the temple and the Sadducees" (4:1), "the rulers and the elders and the scribes and Annas the High Priest and Caiaphas and John and Alexander and all who were of the high-priestly family" (4:5f), "the High Priest and all who were with him, that is the party of the Sadducees" (5:17). These Sadducees had difficulty in proceeding against the disciples because of their great popularity with the people (4:21). One sees very clearly how the author would

like the lines to be drawn: on the one side the Sadducees and the temple authorities and the aristocracy, and on the other the Christians and the great mass of the people. In this situation it is of great significance that Gamaliel should speak a word in favor of the Christians. Gamaliel, like the Christians but unlike the Sadducees, is said to be "held in honor by all the people" (5:34). His advice is to refrain from persecuting the church, to "leave them alone", for it might be that their "plan and their work come from God" (5:38f). In what situation of the church would such a testimony have been most useful? It seems to reflect a time when the Pharisees were undecided about the wisdom of joining in the persecution of the church, but when the church hoped at least for their good will and perhaps even for an acknowledgement of the gospel. In any case the Pharisees should not ally themselves with the rich and powerful, with the Sadducees (and Herod Agrippa). In short, the time at which the church would most have wished that Gamaliel had said what he says here is sometime after the persecution of the church by Herod and the Pharisees, but not so long after this event that the lines between the Pharisees and the church had hardened. At the very least, the Christians want to be treated like other popular, patriotic movements, one in the past (Judas) and one more recent (Theudas).¹ The attitude to the Pharisees expressed here, hopeful but also a bit anxious, will be especially significant when we find something similar in the gospel.

The speech of Stephen adds another note altogether, one which is also reflected in the Proto-Lucan parts of the gospel. We have discussed the anti-cultic implications of the speech in another context, where we also assumed a quasi-Samaritan background for Stephen's polemic against the temple.² The opponents of Stephen are still seen to be the High Priest (7:1), together with the "elders and scribes" (6:12),³ although his real opponents are

¹ The composition of this speech must therefore be set sometime after A.D. 44-46, the procuratorship of Fadus who defeated Theudas. The chronological reversal of Judas and Theudas causes difficulties on any accounting. There does not seem to be any way out except to assume a major error on the part of Luke, which can perhaps be restricted to the addition of the words "after this" in Vs 37. Sahlin, *Messias*, p. 22f, assumes the whole of Vs 36 to be a Lucan addition to his source.

² See above, pp. 154-161.

³ When this latter verse also says that the people (λαός) were stirred up against Jesus, this is so out of accord with the usage of these chapters and Proto-Luke that it must be ascribed to the Lucan redaction.

Zealots from the Diaspora (6:9).¹ While the speech as a whole is definitely in line with a proclamation to Israel (cf. the references to "our fathers"), still it gives expression almost to a feeling of bitterness that this proclamation has been in vain. If Peter's hearers were urged to save themselves from "this crooked generation" (2:40), here only the invective prevails: "you stiff-necked people, uncircumcized in hearts and ears, you always resist the Holy Spirit, you like your fathers. Which of the prophets did your fathers not persecute? And they killed those who proclaimed beforehand the coming of the righteous one, of whom you have now become the betrayers and murderers" (7:51f). It would not be wise to relegate this attitude to a different group or a different time from that which produced the more optimistic chapters 1-5. The alternation between a pleading optimism and a resigned pessimism was given in the very frustrations of a church preaching the fulfilment of the promises to Israel without adequate response, and the same alternation is also to be found in the gospel.

The self-evidentness with which the account of the mission to Samaria is told, Acts 8, leads one to the conclusion that for the Palestinian church Samaria was simply a part of Israel. There is then a progression through these chapters from the most despised part of Israel, Samaria (8:5-25), to the mutilated proselyte, the Ethiopian eunuch who was going to worship at Jerusalem (8:26-40), to the God-fearer Cornelius (10:1-11:18). Whatever these stories might mean in their present Lucan context, it was originally not a question of a development leading to a mission to the Gentiles in the Pauline sense. The salvation that has come to Israel is also for the Gentiles, and even now Gentiles are received into the people of God as a sign of this. But the way to the Gentiles is through Israel, as the next three speeches make clear.

It is usually said ² that the Cornelius story as it now stands makes two independent points, one concerning the ritual purity of

¹ Cf. Reicke, "Der geschichtliche Hintergrund." For the difficulties in the text of Acts 7:58-8:4, together with a suggested solution, cf. Sahlin, *Messias*, pp. 354-357. Although the historicity of this zealous persecution of the church in A.D. 36 cannot be denied (cf. Gal 1:13; I Cor 15:9; Phil 3:6), it may be that the source here did not tell of anything but the martyrdom of Stephen.

² Of now classic significance is the study by M. Dibelius, "The Conversion of Cornelius," *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, London, 1956, pp. 109-122 (originally published 1947).

the Gentiles and the other the question of the Gentile mission, whereby for Luke the latter is decisive in showing how God leads his reluctant church to the Gentiles. However we are not here concerned with the context of Acts as a whole but with a possible source, and it would be well to begin from its own interpretation of the event. In Acts 11:2 Peter is criticized by those "from the circumcision", that is the Jewish-Christian congregation as a whole (cf. 10:45), because he ate with "uncircumcized men." In his own defense Peter retells the story of the vision and his meeting with Cornelius, the point of which seems to be that Cornelius is ritually clean because he has been purified by the Holy Spirit (11:17). Acts 15 refers back to the significance of the Cornelius story in a similar manner: "Some believers from the party of the Pharisees stood up and said, 'It is necessary to circumcize them (Gentile Christians) and urge them to keep the law of Moses' " (15:5). Peter refers back to his own experience in answering them, saying that "God had given to them the Holy Spirit just as he did to us . . . and cleansed their hearts by faith" (Vs 8f). Gentile Christians are therefore pure, and there is no barrier to contact with them on the part of Jewish Christians. As for keeping the law, not even Peter does that (he calls it "a yoke . . . which neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear", Vs 10, cf. Gal 2:14), so why should the burden of it be imposed on Gentiles? It is not necessary for communion with them, and all sides acknowledge ("*we* believe") that it is not necessary for salvation, for both Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians "are saved by the grace of the Lord Jesus" (Vs 11). In none of the discussion about Cornelius is Gentile mission as such at issue. Everyone knows that salvation is for the Gentiles as well as for Israel, even though the fact that this promise is already now being fulfilled in anticipation of the end might cause some surprise (11:18). The only question was *how* these Gentile Christians should live, in full accordance with the Torah like the proselytes or in partial observance like the God-fearers, but that there should be Gentile Christians was not at issue.

There is nothing in the speech of Peter to Cornelius, Acts 10:34-43, to suggest a new departure as far as the Gentiles are concerned. On the contrary, this speech, just like those in Acts 2-3, emphasizes that salvation has come for Israel, and therefore also to the Gentiles. That God shows no partiality among the nations is

called "the word which he sent to the sons of Israel, proclaiming peace through Jesus Christ—he is the Lord of all" (Vs 36). The message of the gospel is universalistic, salvation has come for all, but very significantly this message is to be proclaimed precisely to Israel. This is not only in accord with the missionary message of Deutero-Isaiah, but it is in response to the express commandment of the risen Christ: "He charged us to proclaim to the people (λαός = Israel) and to testify that he is the one who has been ordained by God as judge of the living and the dead" (Vs 42), and we can add: as judge of Israel and the Gentiles. For both, Jews and Gentiles, salvation depends not on nationality but, in accordance with the message of the prophets, is for "everyone who believes in him" (Vs 43). The message is universalistic, but for the present it is to be proclaimed exclusively to Israel. That now also the Gentile Cornelius receives the Holy Spirit in advance of the rest of the Gentiles is a sign of the present fulfillment of the promise to Israel.

The speech in Pisidian Antioch, Acts 13:16-41, is of the same type as the speeches in the first part of Acts, so much so that Sahlin was led to suppose it to have been originally a speech of Barnabas in Antioch on the Orontes, coming after Acts 11:24a.¹ In any case this speech too emphasizes that the word of the gospel is meant for Israel. "The God of this people Israel chose our fathers" (Vs 17), at the time of the exodus and the judges and David. "From his seed, according to the promise, God raised up a savior for Israel, Jesus, John having proclaimed before his coming a baptism of repentance to all the people of Israel" (Vs 23f). "Brethren, sons of the family of Abraham and those among you who are God-fearers, to us has been sent the word of salvation" (Vs 26). The apostles are "his witnesses to the people" (Vs 31), and now "we bring you the good news of the promise given to the fathers, that God has fulfilled it for you the children" (Vs 32f). The gospel is proclaimed to Israel, it is the fulfillment of the promises to Israel, but the content of this gospel is not exclusive, for it says to Israel that "from everything from which you could not be acquitted by the law of Moses, in him (Jesus) everyone who believes is acquitted (δικαιοῦται)" (Vs 38f). Thus while the gospel is in every sense good news for Israel, at the same time it could be resented because in fact it does away with the privileges of Israel. The speech then

¹ *Messias*, pp. 365f.

closes on a different note, one of warning. It is important to see that it is a matter of warning and not of prediction. "Watch out then lest there come upon you what is said in the prophets (Hab 1:5): look you scoffers, and wonder and perish, for I do a work in your days which you will not believe even if one declares it to you" (Vs 40f). The threat in Habakkuk is of the coming of the Chaldeans to destroy Jerusalem, and it may be that something similar is meant here. It is not expected that this will happen—God forbid!—but the threat is there if Israel does not watch out and does not heed the peace proclaimed through Jesus Christ, who is Lord of all (cf. 10:36).

Finally there is the speech of James in Acts 15:13-21, the importance of which in this connection has not been recognized because the quotation from Amos seemed so obviously to be from the LXX. However, we have argued that the quotation represents a reading of the Hebrew text which was current in the Jerusalem church.¹ J. Munck² puts the dilemma very concisely: it may be remarkable that James should cite a divergent text from the LXX, "aber noch auffälliger ist es, dass der Inhalt nicht zu Lukas' Ansicht von der Heilsgeschichte passt, dagegen aber zu der der ältesten Gemeinde." The quotation from Amos by no means refers to a Gentile mission but speaks rather of the Gentiles seeking the Lord after the fallen dwelling of David is rebuilt. Interpreters have been misled by Vs 14, which RSV translates: "God first visited the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name," which seems to refer to the Gentiles as the new people of God. However, in his investigation of the phrase, N. A. Dahl³ has shown that "people for his name" is exclusively a targumic expression, and that the verse must accordingly not be a Lucan formulation but come from Jewish Christianity. Dahl's translation is that God has taken "from Gentiles people for his name." The reason for the misplacement of the word "Gentiles" in RSV is that the verb "visit" requires a direct object, which is here missing but which in an earlier text could only have been Israel. James' speech begins then: "Symeon told how first God visited (Israel) to take from Gentiles people for his name. And with this the words of the prophets agree, as it is written: After this I shall return and I shall build up the tent of

¹ See above, pp. 200-204.

² *Paulus*, p. 229.

³ "'A People for His Name' (Acts xv 14)," *NTS* 4 (1957-58), 319-327.

David which is fallen, and I shall build up its ruins and set it up, so that the rest of men may seek out the Lord, and all the Gentiles on whom my name has been called, says the Lord who makes these things known from of old" (Vs 14-18). The only way in which "the words of the prophets" (N.B. plural) speak of Gentiles is that in the end times they will join themselves to the people of Israel. Typical and a close parallel is Zech 2:14f, "Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion; for lo, I come and I will dwell in the midst of you, says the Lord. And many nations shall join themselves to the Lord in that day, and shall be my people; and I will dwell in the midst of you." This is also the sense of the variant Amos quotation. We have seen that the building of the fallen tent of David can refer only to the re-establishment of the congregation of Israel. The church is experiencing this rebuilding in their own mission to Israel, and so they may be confident that the promise that the Gentiles will seek out the Lord will also be fulfilled. As we have seen, however, the original interest in the Amos citation put all the weight on the first promise, the building up of the congregation of Israel as the new temple.

The speech of James in Acts 15 does not concern the Gentile mission. Here it is important to see just what conclusions are drawn from the variant Amos citation. James does not conclude: therefore we should preach the gospel to Gentiles, but he says rather: therefore we should not burden those Gentiles who do turn to God with the complete Torah given to Israel, but they should be asked to keep only those laws which in the Torah itself are addressed to Gentiles. The Rabbis later developed seven of these Noachic commandments;¹ here, as Haenchen has shown,² the commandments are made up of those things which in the Holiness Code are specifically said to apply to Gentiles: prohibition of meat sacrificed to idols (Lev 17:8), unchastity (18:26), what is strangled (17:13, 15), and blood (17:10, 12). The reason given for the Gentiles keeping these Gentile laws is that they already know them, "for from early

¹ The seven prohibitions usually listed are 1. idolatry, 2. blasphemy, 3. cursing judges, 4. murder, 5. incest and adultery, 6. robbery, and 7. eating blood. Cf. Moore, *Judaism*, Vol. I, pp. 274f., and "Laws, Noachian," *Jewish Encyclopedia*, VII, 648ff. On the importance of these commandments for understanding Paul's attitude to the Gentiles, cf. W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, London, 1955², pp. 114ff.

² *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 411; cf. W. Schmithals, *Paulus und Jakobus*, Göttingen, 1963, Ch. VI.

generations Moses has had in every city those who preach him, for he is read every Sabbath in the synagogues" (Vs 21). Far from advocating a Gentile mission on the part of the church, James simply assumes that Gentiles will turn to God as God-fearers attached to the synagogues of the diaspora.¹ There is no Christian mission to the Gentiles at all in the Pauline sense, but only a mission of all Israel to the Gentiles. It is in connection with this latter "mission" that James says to Israel that Gentiles partake of Israel's salvation not by becoming proselytes and keeping Israel's law, but by becoming God-fearers and keeping certain laws revealed for Gentiles, for both "we" (Israel) and "they" (Gentiles) are "saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus" (Vs 11).

The early parts of Acts 1-15 were not written for Gentiles, and they are not even particularly edifying for Gentile Christians. They were written for Jewish Christians and through them for all of Israel. This can be seen especially in the matter of the Gentiles, who are discussed exclusively from the standpoint of Israel. The Jewish-Christian church and Luke both agree on the order: "to the Jew first and also to the Greek,"² but whereas Luke is interested in the second half of this phrase, the Palestinean church was interested primarily in the first half. Whether the Gentiles should partake of Israel's salvation was never at issue, but it was assumed that this would come at the end, through the salvation first accepted by Israel. For the present it is only a matter of proleptic Gentile Christians, the *arrabon* of a promise of the fullness of the Gentiles to be fulfilled in the future. The way in which these present Gentiles are treated is a sign of Israel's faith in the promise and an anticipation of their future status. Two questions are discussed and decided: that one may have table fellowship with them because they have been made clean by the Holy Spirit, and that the Torah of Israel does not apply to them. Two questions which are never discussed, however, are whether the salvation promised to Israel applies to

¹ That this is the plain meaning of the text has been stated impressively by Munck, *Paulus*, pp. 104f, 229f. If one begins with the assumptions of Dibelius and Haenchen, it is no wonder that they find that this verse "nach Zusammenhang und Bedeutung zu den schwierigsten des NTs gehört" (Dibelius, *Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte*, Göttingen, 1951, p. 87, cited in Haenchen, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 391).

² Cf. Jervell, art. cit. This is not only the pattern of Acts as a whole (Jerusalem church/Paul), but it is also a constantly repeated pattern from Antioch to Rome: Paul begins preaching in the synagogue and then turns to Gentiles.

Gentiles at all (of course!) and whether the Christians should by-pass Israel and preach directly to the Gentiles (of course not!).

The passages we have discussed seem to have originated in the situation of a church engaged primarily in preaching to Israel, and the preaching seems to reflect what was in fact said to Israel. The promise is to Israel, but so are the threats. But in spite of the threats and in spite of the persecution of the Sadducees, the story is told as a success story. The Jerusalem church has hopes for the good favor of the Pharisees and the mass of the people, and they seem optimistic about the promises but not the threats coming to pass. There is the same mood here as in the birth stories, a mood of optimism and rejoicing in the salvation God has brought, which will be "a light for revelation to the Gentiles and glory for thy people Israel" (Lk 2:32).

We turn now to the gospel to put our thesis to the test. Is there reflected in those parts of the gospel designated as Proto-Luke an attitude to Israel and the Gentiles similar to that which we surmised in the early chapters of Acts went back to the Jerusalem church itself? Should this prove to be the case, then we would have demonstrated a background adequate to account for the predictions of the fall of Jerusalem in the Lucan special material. As we have already seen that the birth stories could properly be understood only in the context of proclamation to Israel, we shall begin with the account of John the Baptist in Luke 3.

We have seen that the preaching of the early church renewed all the more vehemently John's call to repentance before the coming judgment. John's preaching as John's baptism are then still relevant and what is reported about him here is not motivated by mere historical interest. For Paul baptism is the typological equivalent of the crossing of the Red Sea,¹ and in view of the great importance of the exodus tradition for Proto-Luke, it is possible that the same conception is to be presupposed here; we note for example that *all* the people must undergo baptism, 3:21. It is appropriate that the account of John the Baptist should begin with a citation from the great prophet of the exodus tradition, Deutero-Isaiah. That "all flesh shall see the salvation of God" is neither an addition by Luke to a Proto-Lucan text, nor is it an example of Lucan "universalism", for it is exactly parallel to 2:31f. John addresses the multitudes as

¹ 1 Cor 10:1ff; cf. J. Jeremias, "Der Ursprung der Johannestaufe," *ZNW* 28 (1929), 312-320.

"brood of vipers" and calls upon them to bear "worthy fruits of repentance," not counting on descent from Abraham as in itself enough for salvation. For "God is able from these stones (אבנים) to raise up children (בנים) to Abraham" (3:7f). There is here not the slightest suggestion that these are Gentile stones, or that salvation is for any other than the children of Abraham (cf. Lk 1:55, 73; 13:16, 28; 19:9; Acts 3:25; 7:17; 13:26). This saying is not a prediction of the coming of Gentiles but a warning to Israel, as was originally the following saying: "the axe is already against the root of the tree." The threat is of judgment against, even the complete destruction of Israel, the fig-tree.¹ Here as elsewhere we must be careful to distinguish between prediction and conditional threat and warning. Concretely, John's message is against the rich, who are told to share their wealth (Vs 11), and for two of the most despised professions in Israel, the tax-collectors and the mercenary troops (Vs 12-14). We note that repentance for them does not mean abandoning their profession but living in such a way as to secure peace between Israel and Rome. John preaches the necessity of repentance before the coming judgment,² but this is also very much a part of the proclamation of the church, so that his message can be called part of the good news, the gospel (εὐηγγελίζετο τὸν λαόν) (Vs 18).

Jesus' baptism and temptation present him, as we have seen, as the servant of Is 42:1, the Mosaic prophet, and it is the function of this prophet to proclaim good news to Israel (Lk 4:16-30). The recipients of this good news should be noted in detail: they are the poor, the broken-hearted, the captives, the blind, and the oppressed. It is perhaps not reading too much into the text to see here the common Proto-Lucan opposition of the poor and the rich, the common people over against the Sadducees and Romans. Twice the word ἄφεσις, "liberation, freedom," appears, which is definitely relevant to the political situation of the time. Here is the fulfilment of the

¹ So convincingly Sahlin, *Studien*, pp. 34-37. The addition of the individualizing Vs 9b, under the influence of the Q saying Mt 7:19, caused the change to the plural δένδρων. Sahlin thinks in terms of a vine (Israel is called a vine Hos 10:1; Jer 2:21; Ezek 15:1ff; 17:5ff; 19:10ff; Ps 80:9ff; 4 Ezra 5:23), but in light of Lk 13:6-9 and Mk 11:11-14, we should perhaps think rather of the fig tree (cf. Joel 1:7; Hos 9:10).

² Vs 16 contains a Markan addition to the Proto-Lucan text, which originally read something like "I baptize you with water, but he who is coming will baptize you with fire." Also in Vs 3 the words "baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins" are a Markan addition.

promise to raise the lowly and fill the hungry, to help Israel the servant (Lk 1:51-54), and it is also the "consolation of Israel," the "redemption of Jerusalem" (2:25, 38). Jesus does not however proclaim vengeance, retribution on the enemies of the poor, for the omission of the last phrase of Is 61:1f, "and a day of vengeance of our God," is not accidental. Jeremias¹ suggests that this is the reason for the criticism of Jesus' hearers, and he would accordingly translate Vs 22 as: "they protested with one voice and were furious because of the words of (God's) grace which came out of his mouth (without the corresponding words of God's vengeance), and they said: Is not this the son of Joseph?" Here we see being fulfilled the prophecy of Simeon that the coming of Jesus would mean "the revelation of the thoughts of many hearts . . . a sign that is spoken against, for the fall or rising of many in Israel" (2:34f). Israel is divided by the preaching of the gospel, but nevertheless it is still Israel to whom the gospel is being preached. It would be a mistake to see in the examples of Elijah going to the widow of Zarephath and Elisha cleansing Naaman a reference to a future mission to the Gentiles. They are meant rather as a warning to Israel, a warning not to count on their nationality as enough for salvation, but rather to repent before it is too late. The two examples are taken up again in the story of the widow of Nain (7:11-17) and the Samaritan leper (17:12-19). Insofar as Jesus' rejection in Nazareth reflects the mission situation of the church, the mission is meeting with resistance, but it is still a mission to Israel.

The Sermon on the Plain, differing from Matthew's version, is addressed not only to the disciples (6:20) but also to the crowd (6:19; 7:1). Corresponding to the blessings for the poor, the hungry, those who weep, and those who are hated, are woes for the rich, the filled, those who laugh, and those who are well liked (6:21-26). Bammel² has shown through Luke's redaction of Mark that Luke is not especially interested in the question of poor vs. rich; this only emphasizes all the more the very sharp antithesis in Proto-Luke (cf. 1:51-54; 12:15, 21, 33f; 14:33; 16:10-13), which reminds us of the similar social polemic in the epistle of James.³ To the poor the gospel is good news (cf. 4:18; 7:22), while for the rich it means judgment. This does not mean that the poor are to seek revenge on

¹ *Jesus' Promise to the Nations*, London, 1958, pp. 44f.

² *TWNT* VI, 904-907.

³ Cf. M. Dibelius, *Der Brief des Jakobus*, Göttingen, 1957⁹, pp. 37-44.

their oppressors; on the contrary the message of the gospel is reconciliation between the oppressed and their enemies. Grundmann¹ sees in Lk 6:27-38 a single poem devoted to this theme, which is loosely based on the similar message of Is 58:6-12. It seeks to answer the question, "Wie kann die zerrissene Gemeinschaft geheilt werden und neue Gemeinschaft entstehen?" This refers not only to social differences within Israel but also to the relationship between Israel and the Gentiles. Three times the hearers are urged to go beyond what the ἄμαρτωλοί do, and the parallel Mt 5:47 shows that the sense of the word is "Gentiles."² The enemies with whom Israel is here being urged to be reconciled are then the Gentiles, specifically the Roman occupying forces. Perhaps the striking of the cheek and the taking of the outer garment are also to be understood of the Gentiles.³ We can note how well the following teaching for the disciples, Lk 6:39-49, would fit into the discussion concerning the admissibility of Gentiles into the church. The exhortation of the Sermon was not just general but quite concretely met the situation in which it was transmitted.

It is difficult to imagine that the story of the healing of the centurion's servant could have been told without the teller thinking of the centurion Cornelius (Acts 10). Both are friendly toward Judaism (Lk 7:5; Acts 10:2, 22), and in both stories there is a question whether a Jew might defile himself by entering his house (Lk 7:6; Acts 10:28). It is indeed probable that we have here the real meaning of the Cornelius story, which was told not to indicate the beginning of a mission to the Gentiles, but to shame an all too particularistic Israel by telling how even now, as an exception and sign of the eschatological coming of the Gentiles, a Roman officer was helped by Jesus or cleansed by the Holy Spirit. This story is in

¹ *Lukas*, pp. 145-151, quotation on p. 146. Cf. the Aramaic version in Burney, *The Poetry of our Lord*, Oxford, 1925, p. 169.

² The original may very well have been מִלִּי; cf. Mk 14:41; Gal 2:15; and Rengstorf, *TWNT* I, 332, who refers to Schlatter and A. Meyer for ἄμαρτωλοί and ἔθνηκοί as "Wechselbegriffen".

³ The striking on the cheek would be more likely to come from a foreign soldier, and a fellow Jew was expressly forbidden to take anyone's outer garment (Ex 22:25f; Dt 24:12f). The third example, given only by Mt 5:41, certainly refers to the Roman forces, for the word ἀγγαρεύω is a technical term referring to the impressing of civilians into military use. Cf. Mk 15:21 and Manson, *Mission and Message*, p. 452, who comments aptly, "The first mile renders to Caesar the things that are Caesar's; the second mile, by meeting oppression with kindness, renders to God the things that are God's."

any case not told for the edification of Gentiles but in order to shame Israel: "I say to you, not even in Israel have I found such faith" (Lk 7:9).

There is as we saw a Proto-Lucan parenthesis in Jesus' words about John the Baptist which is typical for its attitude to Israel: "All the people and the tax-collectors justified God, having been baptized with the baptism of John, but the Pharisees and the lawyers rejected the will of God for them, not having been baptized by him" (7:29f). On the side of the gospel are all the people and the tax-collectors and John the Baptist; on the other side are the Pharisees and the *νομικοί*, a typical Proto-Lucan word.¹ The fronts have been established, but the church optimistically claims for itself the good will of the people as a whole. The attitude to the Pharisees is ambiguous, as we shall see.

If Proto-Luke sometimes considers the Pharisees as enemies of the gospel, at other times they are shown in a more friendly light. Three times in this gospel (7:36; 11:37; 14:1) Jesus is said to have been invited to the house of a Pharisee to eat with him, a situation which does not appear in any of the other gospels. We can also refer to the statement that when Herod is seeking to kill Jesus, it is Pharisees who warn him to flee (13:31). As we said in connection with the speech of Gamaliel in Acts 5, such notices are meaningful only if the church is still speaking to the Pharisees and seeking to win them as adherents. At the same time, the actual contents of the three stories where Jesus is the guest of a Pharisee are indications of rather violent discussions. Thus if the church was still on a friendly enough footing to carry on conversations with the Pharisees and to seek their good will, these conversations do not seem to have borne much fruit but rather to have intensified the disagreement between the two groups.

The relationship of the story of the sinful woman, Lk 7:36-50, and the anointing at Bethany, Mk 14:3-9; Jn 12:1-8, need not be discussed here beyond the remark that the Lucan story seems to be the more primitive. We can still see signs of composition in Luke, for the parable of Vs 40-43, which makes the point that love is the result of forgiveness, seems to have been inserted into the story of

¹ It appears only in Proto-Luke, here and at 10:25 (whence it has entered many texts of Mt 22:35 by assimilation); 11:45, 46, 52, 53; 14:3. Cf. above, p. 287, note 5.

Vs 36-39, 44-47a, where love is the ground of forgiveness.¹ The point of both, however, is to justify Jesus' relationship to the sinful woman over against the Pharisees, whose own righteousness is not denied but who are insensitive to the need of the less righteous for forgiveness. There is no doubt that this reflects the actual situation of the Pharisees and the early Christian church.

We turn now to what has been called the "central section" or the "travel document" of Luke's gospel. It is clear that in Proto-Luke it is neither. Lk 9:51ff can hardly be called a central section when it makes up the bulk of the gospel and there is no clearly defined "Galilean section" before it. The term "travel document" can also not be restricted to Lk 9:51ff, for Jesus is shown throughout Proto-Luke to be a wanderer (cf. 4:44; 5:1; 6:17; 7:1, 11; 8:1). It is true that Jerusalem is mentioned as the goal of Jesus' wandering (9:51) only after it was announced at the transfiguration (9:31), but from the very beginning, after the people of Nazareth tried to kill him and he "went away" (4:30), Jesus has been wandering on his way to his death. As far as the decision to go to Jerusalem is concerned, 9:51 cannot be given programmatic significance, for the same decision is announced all over again as if it were something new in 13:33. It is therefore difficult to find any principle by which the material has been organized. One cannot find a consistent Christological² or *heilsgeschichtliche*³ approach because none was intended. The suggestion of Evans⁴ that the material was arranged to correspond with the order of Deuteronomy is possible but the connection often seems tenuous. Reicke's observation⁵ that the material alternates between instruction and discussion is valid as far as it goes but is too general to be of much use. Using Reicke's terminology one could just as well apply the same characterization to the earlier

¹ Vs 48-50 were not in Proto-Luke but seem to have been added by Luke, for they contain reminiscences of Lk 5:20f; 8:48 in stories which Luke has taken over from Mark.

² Conzelmann, *Mitte der Zeit*.

³ Robinson, *Der Weg des Herrn*.

⁴ See above, p. 289, note 1.

⁵ "Instruction and Discussion in the Travel Narrative," *Studia Evangelica* (TU 73), Berlin, 1959, pp. 206-216. For the reasons why the section Lk 9:51-19:27 cannot really be called a "travel document", cf. the two extensive studies in *Synoptische Studien A. Wikenhauser dargebracht*, München, 1953, by J. Blinzler, "Die literarische Eigenart des sogenannten Reiseberichtes im Lukas-Evangelium," pp. 20-52, and J. Schneider, "Zur Analyse des lukanischen Reiseberichtes," pp. 207-229.

portions of Proto-Luke: 4:16-30, discussion; 5:1-11; 6:12-49, instruction; 7:1-49, discussion; 8:1-3; 9:28-36, instruction. The "central section" of Luke contains material relevant to the church in its own life and in its missionary and apologetic relationship to those outside, and in this it does not differ from any of the gospel material. The organization of the stories and sayings in this section of Luke shows only the beginnings of any kind of systematic theological ordering; in this too it is not different from most other gospel material. Any reference to a special "central section" is then meaningless for our purposes, but the material contained therein is relevant insofar as the situation presupposed is that of the mission of the church to Israel.

Proto-Luke has a special interest in the Samaritans, and it is likely that the story of the Samaritan village, Lk 9:51-56, reflects the mission situation of his time. In the parable of the good Samaritan (10:30-37) and the story of the Samaritan leper (17:11-19), on the other hand, the Samaritan seems to be brought into the story more to shame Israel, even if a friendly attitude of Jesus is presupposed without question. The gospel of John shares this interest in the Samaritans, one of the many points of contact of Johannine and Proto-Lucan material. One gets the impression from Jn 4:4-42 and especially from the account of the mission in Samaria Acts 8:1-25 that the mission of the church was quite successful.¹ That this is an overly optimistic view is shown not only by what little we know of the history of the Samaritan church (cf. the Samaritan Justin, 1 Apol 26:3), but also by the pericope Lk 9:51-56. A certain Samaritan village would not receive Jesus, whereupon his disciples wanted to take revenge on that village, but Jesus rebuked them and they went to another (Samaritan?) village. This injunction not to be angry with the Samaritans was surely pertinent to the mission situation of the Palestinean church. We must seriously consider whether for the early church, at least as it is reflected in Proto-Luke, Samaritans were not also "children of Abraham" and thus equal recipients of the fulfilment of the promises to Israel.

¹ The whole relationship of the early church to Samaria needs to be investigated further. Cf. the important beginnings made by O. Cullmann, "Samaria and the Origins of the Christian Mission. Who are the ΑΑΑΟΙ of John 4, 38?," *The Early Church*, London, 1956, pp. 185-193; and "L'opposition contre le temple de Jérusalem, motif commun de la théologie johannique et du monde ambiant," *NTS* 5 (1959), 157-173.

It is generally recognized that the sending of the seventy Lk 10:1-24 reflects clearly the missionary situation of the church. As in Proto-Luke this is the only sending of missionaries, the number 70 is not to be seen in contrast to the 12 as indicating a Gentile mission but refers rather to the 70 elders of Ex 34:1; Num 11:16. It seems to have been the common missionary practice of the early church to operate from one household¹ in a village, the situation which is reflected in Vs 5-7. It is possible that the phrase "son of peace" is here a designation for a Christian. It is twice emphasized (Vs 7, 8) that the messengers are to eat whatever is put before them, without questioning whether or not it is clean or whether or not the tithes have been paid. As we shall see (Lk 11:39, 42) these two points are ones the church disputed with the Pharisees, as well as among themselves (Acts 11:3). Also the evidence of Lk 10 shows that in general the early church did not take the food laws very seriously. Insofar as Lk 10 reflects the later missionary situation, we can sense that the mission was not having much success. It may be that a whole village will refuse to hear the missionaries, in which case they should leave it but not give up hope for its inhabitants and certainly not call down upon it the fire of judgment (9:54). It is rather pathetic how the missionaries even while they are leaving call out the word of the gospel, "nevertheless know that the kingdom of God has come near" (Vs 11). One last appeal to repentance is called out, together with a threat of what will happen if the call is not heeded.² The following woes on the Galilean cities are indicative of the difficulties of the Christian mission. As Bultmann says,³ the woes against Capernaum "setzen den Misserfolg der christlichen Predigt in Kapernaum voraus." In the face of this discouraging situation the missionaries have to be encouraged: "he who hears you hears me, and he who rejects you rejects me, and he who rejects me rejects him who sent me" (Vs 16). The missionaries are not to despair over their failures, but on the other hand they are also not to be too proud of their accomplishments in exorcism, as Vs 17-20 make clear. The prayer of Jesus, Vs 21-22, incidentally also tells us some-

¹ Acts 2:46; 5:42; 10:27; 12:12. Cf. the exegesis and interesting conclusions for modern missionary practice drawn by Roland Allen, *Missionary Methods, St. Paul's or Ours*, London, 1912.

² Grundmann, *Lukas*, p. 210, aptly characterizes Vs 12, "I tell you that it will be more bearable for Sodom on that day than for that town," as "ein Ruf zur Umkehr vor dem drohenden Gericht."

³ *Syn. Trad.*, p. 118.

thing about the state of the mission of the church: "I thank thee Father . . . that thou hast hidden these things from the wise and intelligent and hast revealed them to infants." Evidently the church was not able to convert many of the scribes and leaders and had to be content with the Am ha-aretz.

The next section Lk 10:25-37 takes up the theme of discussion with opponents. The parable of the good Samaritan is told to indicate the answer to a question of interpretation, the meaning of the word "neighbor" in Lev 19:18. The opponent, a νομιμασ, not only needs to be told to consider the Samaritan as a רעה, a member of the people of God, but he is also portrayed as one who is self-righteous, as are the Pharisees of 16:15 and 18:9ff. We can readily assume that such discussion was carried on in the church, but again we sense that it met with little success.

The story of Mary and Martha Lk 10:38-42 has been shown by Reicke¹ to deal with the same problem as does Acts 6, the relation between "liturgy" and "diacony". The section on prayer Lk 11:1-13 also makes reference to the missionary situation of the church in that a travelling friend seeks accommodation at a house at midnight, and he is promised that if he prays (knocks) "it will be opened for you."

With the Beelzebul sayings Lk 11:14-23 we are again in the area of controversy with opponents of the church. The accusation that Jesus casts out demons with the help of Beelzebul is understandable only on Palestinean ground and contains perhaps a reference to a supposed claim of Jesus to be Lord of the temple. The saying about the return of the unclean spirit 11:24-26 seems to be a warning about backsliding, which must have already happened. If the saying Lk 11:27f belongs in this context, then it can only refer to Zion as the mother of the Messiah as in the birth stories: Jesus then says that obedience to the word of God is more important than belonging to Zion. The saying about the sign of Jonah 11:29-32 is pertinent for us in two connections. It seems to illustrate the sign that is spoken against, that is set for the rise and fall of many in Israel (2:34), and it indicates the place of the Gentiles in the mission preaching of the church. The queen of the south and the men of Nineveh are Gentiles, but they are mentioned here not for their own sake but in order to shame Israel for not responding in the way they did (cf. 4:25, 27; 7:9).

¹ "Instruction and Discussion," p. 212.

This is perhaps the place to point out that a common misunderstanding of the third gospel as "the Gentile Gospel" is very misleading. Thus in a recent summary statement, V. Taylor¹ can list as the very first of the Lucan "distinctive characteristics" his "universalism." That this so-called "universalism" of Luke's gospel is an unexamined myth handed down from one generation to the next is argued persuasively by N. Q. King.² Of course Luke is universalistic, if one likes to use the word, but no more so than the Old Testament prophets, and there is no reflection in his gospel of a Gentile mission in the Pauline sense. If King is right about Luke, his conclusions hold even more for Proto-Luke. Here it is important to recognize that the Gentiles mentioned in the gospel and in the early parts of Acts are brought into the story not for their own sake but always because of what their example can teach Israel. In fact it is precisely those stories dealing with Gentiles which best show that Proto-Luke is the reflection of the preaching of a Palestinian church to Israel.

Lk 11:37-52 contains the great speech against the Pharisees. When we compare it with Mt 23, it is evident that it represents an earlier form of the discourse. This can be demonstrated not only by the individual sayings³ but also by the general situation. Jesus is pictured as having been invited to dine with a Pharisee, and sharp as the denunciations may be, there is nothing to compare with the bitterness of Mt 23. The accusation of hypocrisy does not appear, and in Aramaic the woes would not have been directed against the Pharisees in general ("Woe to you Pharisees who..." (7), not "Woe to you Pharisees! For..."). Nevertheless this compilation is evidence of a strong feeling on the part of the church against the Pharisees. The three accusations against them concern eating in ritual purity, tithing, and pride, precisely the three points which would disturb an Am ha-aretz.⁴ The sayings on purity may once have comprised a pronouncement story independent of the present catalogue of accusations, and the sayings themselves have been

¹ *IDB*, III, 183.

² "The 'Universalism' of the Third Gospel," *Studia Evangelica* (TU 73), Berlin, 1959, pp. 199-205.

³ Cf. Manson, *Mission and Message*, pp. 386-397.

⁴ Cf. Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, II, 494ff; Moore, *Judaism*, II, 76; Jeremias, "Der Gedanke des 'Heiligen Restes' im Spätjudentum und in der Verkündigung Jesu," *ZNW* 42 (1949), 184-194, p. 185. Grundmann, *Lukas*, p. 247f, points to the similar accusations in Ass. Mosis 7:3-10, but there they seem to be directed against the Sadducees.

quite garbled in transmission.¹ But even if the detail is not clear, here is one more witness to the fact that the early church and presumably Jesus himself were very careless about their purity, which set them off from the Pharisees from the very beginning. No one was as scrupulous as the Pharisees about tithing, but here some are accused of going too far, for "mint and rue and all the herbs" were not subject to tithes.² The second woe concerns pride and the third the accusation of seeming to be clean (the grave is hidden) whereas in fact they are a source of uncleanness for all who come in contact with them. If the Pharisees are quite correctly viewed as the adherents of a certain practice, the lawyers are reprov'd for their teaching. The complaint that their interpretations make the burden of the law unbearable reminds us of the similar statement of Peter Acts 15:10, "why place a yoke on the neck of disciples which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?" The lawyers are castigated as those who revere only dead prophets and as the sons³ of their fathers who killed them. Finally the lawyers by making knowledge of Torah esoteric also made obedience to it impossible for the average man. If the content of these woes seems more than in Matthew to reflect a period in which the church and the Pharisees were still on speaking terms, the form of organization in 3 + 3 woes seems to suggest that they have been collected and transmitted by Christian prophets as denunciation pure and simple.⁴

A prophetic denunciation calls for a prophetic threat, and this is exactly what has been inserted into the speech against the Pharisees, Lk 11:49-51, probably because of the reference in the previous woes to the tradition about the killing of the prophets. The saying is

¹ E.g. Vs 40 makes no sense at all when examined closely. Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, Berlin, 1911², p. 27, wanted to explain the variants of Mt 23:26, "cleanse" and Lk 11:41, "give alms", by supposing that Lk has mistakenly read "zakkau" for the proper "dakkau" (surely the ending should be -ô not -au?). This does not seem very likely, but we have to find some means of explaining Luke's strange text. Perhaps a solution can be seen in the fact that the Qal of the verb זָכָא can mean to do good, i.e. give alms (Lev R 34) while the Pael means to cleanse (Targ Ps 78:13).

² Pointed out by Manson, *Mission and Message*, p. 390. Rue is expressly exempted Sheb 9:1. There is then no point in Vs 42b, which should be omitted with D as an intrusion from Mt 23:23.

³ Here is one of the most classic examples of a mistranslation by Luke. Proto-Luke would have intended as in Mt 23:31 בְּנֵי, which Luke misread as בָּנִי.

⁴ So Bultmann, *syn. Trad.*, p. 118f.

clearly not a saying of Jesus but of an early Christian prophet,¹ as is shown by the introduction, "Therefore also the wisdom of God said. . ." The idea that this is an indication of a quotation from a lost apocryphal book called ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ is no less absurd for having been so often adopted. The same is true of the suggestion that Lk 13:34f was originally part of the same quotation, just because the two are joined in Mt 23:34-39.² It is true that there is evidence of a wisdom Christology in the synoptic gospels,³ but the present saying is not concerned with Christology at all, and there is no reason to suppose that all sayings with a common conception also came from the same written source. Jesus spoke in his own name, but the Christian prophets transmitted words of the Lord, or in this case of his attribute of wisdom. "Therefore also thus says the wisdom of God: I will send them prophets and missionaries,⁴ and they will kill and persecute some of them, with the result that the blood of all the prophets shed from the creation of the world will be required of this generation." The theme of the murder of the prophets has been traced in the apocryphal and patristic literature by Schoeps; in the New Testament it seems to have been transmitted by New Testament prophets in reference to their own persecution. The words "this generation" are also a sign of transmission by Christian prophets, as can be easily seen by the contexts in which they appear.⁵ That the specific reference to prophets is here somewhat forced is shown by the examples given of righteous blood shed: from Abel in the beginning of Scripture to Zechariah the priest at the end (2 Chron 24:20ff).⁶

References to the end of the world have come to us in the synoptic

¹ Cf. E. E. Ellis, "Luke xi 49-51: An Oracle of a Christian Prophet?," *Exp. Times* 74 (1963), 157-158, who suggests that a Christian prophet has "peshered" a genuine saying of Jesus. This is possible, but in its present form the saying clearly reflects the later situation.

² That the two do not belong together, cf. Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 80; Manson, *Mission and Message*, p. 394; Haenchen, "Matthäus 23," *ZThK* 48 (1951), 38-62.

³ Lk 7:31-35; 13:34f; Mt 11:25-30; cf. Wilckens, *TWNT* VII, 515-518, and Davies, *Paul*, pp. 147-176.

⁴ מְשִׁיחִים in this sense rather than the technical use of ἀπόστολοι.

⁵ Lk 7:31par; 11:29-32par; 11:50fpar; 17:25; Mk 8:12par; 8:38 par; 9:19par; 13:30par; Mt 12:45; cf. Acts 2:40. On these sayings cf. M. Meinertz, "Dieses Geschlecht" im Neuen Testament," *Bibl Zeit* 1 (1957), 283-289.

⁶ Mt 23:35 seems to have brought the list up to date, if we are to identify his Zechariah son of Barachiah with the Zechariah son of Baris (?) of Josephus, B.J. IV, 335.

gospels in two context, both prophetic, as a promise for the relief of the persecuted church and as a threat to the unrepentant. The theme of the murder of the prophets is interesting because it unites both motifs: the unrepentant who are being castigated are at the same time those who persecute the church and its prophets. Thus a bridge has been formed between two facets of the tradition which originally were quite separate: the preaching of the church to an unrepentant Israel ending in a threat, and the exhortation to the members of the church to endure persecution ending in a promise. The two are found together not only in Mt 23-25 (and to some extent in Mk 12-13) but also here in Luke, where the denunciation of the Pharisees is immediately followed by eschatological exhortation in the light of persecution.

The sayings on light, Lk 11:33-36, originally formed a unit with the sayings on proclaiming in public what one has heard privately, 12:2-3.¹ Although 11:34-36 are notoriously difficult to interpret,² the saying about putting the lamp on the stand seems to refer to the calling of the disciples to be "a light for revelation" (2:32), and the proclamation from the housetops is part of the same call to mission. Lk 12:4 with the new introduction, "I say to you, my friends. . ." begins a new but related section, where it is apparent that the preaching of the church has met with enough opposition that the disciples must be urged not to be afraid. They are not to fear their persecutors but rather God (Vs 4f, cf. Acts 4:19f; 5:29). They have the promise that God will protect them now (Vs 6-7) and that the Son of Man will acknowledge and not deny them at the judgment (Vs 8-9). We note again how reference to the judgment has been transmitted as a promise for enduring persecution. Vs 10 is very significant in this context, because it refers directly to the mission situation of the first generation in Jerusalem: rejection of Jesus can be forgiven (cf. Acts 3:17) but blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, the refusal to hearken to the preaching of the church cannot be forgiven.³ That this refusal to heed the church's preaching

¹ They were broken up by Luke, who wanted to interpret the latter as a warning against the Pharisees acting as agents provocateurs, in accordance with 11:53, a Lucan composition as the language shows. 12:1 was also added by Luke at this point from Mk 8:15, along with a situation which fits neither the preceding nor the following.

² Cf. C. Edlund, *Das Auge der Einfalt*, Uppsala, 1952.

³ Cf. A. Fridrichsen, "Le péché contre le Saint-Esprit," *RHPR* 3 (1923),

was not an unusual occurrence is shown by the following promise, which presupposes that the missionaries will be brought before "synagogues and rulers and authorities" (Vs 11). They are not to be anxious, for they are promised the help of the Holy Spirit in such a situation. That the similar saying Mk 13:11 is in a more apocalyptic context is due to the more desperate situation of the persecutions there reflected. In the gospel tradition exhortation to mission and to endurance in persecution goes together with exhortation to watchfulness before the end.

The parable of the rich fool (12:13-21) and the sayings about anxiety (12:22-34) are in their present context eschatological exhortation for the disciples. The parable, which was probably from the beginning attached to the discussion about Jesus as a divider, makes the point that concern with riches is foolish in the light of the suddenness of the coming end.¹ This is one of the crisis parables which has secondarily but appropriately been applied to the disciples rather than to Israel as a whole. The sayings about anxiety have also been used as specifically eschatological exhortation.² Indeed, they end with a saying which can well stand as the essence of Jesus' eschatological teaching, insofar as this has been transmitted with primary reference to the disciples: "Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom" (12:32).

Lk 12:35-39 contains the remnants of three parables, a sign of their transmission by early Christian prophets as eschatological exhortation. Jeremias³ discusses them all together as parousia parables which have grown out of crisis parables originally spoken to Israel. This recognition is of great importance. The situation which characterizes all three fragments is that of someone, twice a master and once a thief, coming suddenly and therefore the necessity of watching and being prepared. In the first two there are allegorical traits, when the master comes from a wedding feast (Mt 8:11, etc.) and when the master serves his servants at table (Lk 22:27; Jn 13). The coming will be a joyous event, and so the second fragment

367-372. This saying was not relevant for any other group of people, and Mk 3:28f has therefore so generalized it as to make it trivial.

¹ The moral in Vs 21, which misses the point, is an addition by Luke based on 12:33f.

² Contra Bultmann, *syn. Trad.*, p. 109. Cf. 12:11, *μὴ μεριμνήσητε*.

³ *Gleichnisse*, pp. 40-43, 45-47. He would like to see one parable of the doorman in Vs 35-38, but Vs 37 marks clearly a new beginning. That these are not complete parables, cf. on Mk 13:33ff above, pp. 39-41.

contains both at the beginning and the end the statement: "Blessed are those servants." In the parable of the thief, on the other hand, the coming is seen as something to be feared, and we see that the original reference was not to relief from persecution or the bliss of the coming kingdom, but to the day of judgment. Vs 40, "be prepared; in an hour when you do not expect it the Son of Man comes," seems to have originally spoken of the coming of the day of the Lord, as in the echoes of the parable of the thief 1 Thes 5:2, 4; 2 Pet 3:10. It seems improbable that the term Son of Man was ever understood in Proto-Luke to refer to the parousia, but this is a matter which can be decided only in connection with the four Son of Man sayings in Lk 17. The concluding remark of Peter ¹ is remarkably similar to the ending of Mk 13, where Jesus says to the four disciples, "what I say to you I say to all: watch!" (Mk 13:37). We saw there an indication of awareness of the fact that the preceding teaching was meant for the whole church and not just for the generation which first heard it. So here too Peter says, "Lord, do you tell this parable for us (only) or for all?" It is for the whole church that this eschatological parenesis was transmitted, and this passage is very important in a discussion of the development of parenesis in the early church.

The parable of the faithful servant and the attached sayings on the servant's wages, Lk 12:42-48, have similarly been transmitted in such a way as to apply to a specific problem in the early church. Particularly the two sayings at the end, Vs 47-48a and Vs 48b, could have been warnings to the Pharisees of their special responsibility over against the Am ha-aretz, and this is perhaps an indication of the original reference of the parable also. In its present form, however, the parable contains a very strange trait: because of the master's delay the steward begins to beat his fellow servants and to get drunk. A convincing explanation of this strange behavior was offered by B. Reicke.² In an overheated apocalyptic atmosphere the anticipation of the joys of the Messianic banquet could lead to drunkenness, and the anticipation of eschatological power (Mt 19:28; 1 Cor 6:2; Rev 3:21) could lead to this kind of overbearing authority.

¹ That Vs 41 is to be taken with the parable which precedes and not that which follows is shown by the reference ταύτην; contra Jeremias, *Gleichnisse*, p. 48.

² *Diakonie, Festfreude und Zelos in Verbindung mit der altchristlichen Agapenfeier*, Uppsala, 1951, pp. 234-240.

Also the Palestinian church stood in danger of such "Gewaltsamkeit und Schwelgerei."¹ This parable too is eschatological exhortation, but applied by early prophets specifically to the leaders of the church, warning them against impatience at the delay of the parousia. There is then a double reference to the end. On the one hand the church is experiencing impatience for the parousia as a reaction to discouraging mission results and even persecution. On the other hand the leaders of the church are warned that if they let their impatience get the best of them the parousia will mean for them not vindication but judgment.² We have been interested in all this eschatological exhortation for the disciples in terms of the light it throws on the situation of the church with respect to Israel, but we shall return to these texts in our discussion of early Christian prophecy.

Insofar as the sayings and stories of Proto-Luke reflect the mission situation of the Palestinian church, we have seen how this mission was meeting with frustrations and even persecution. In such a situation thoughts would naturally turn to the end, to the time of judgment which would purify Israel by fire and water. It is precisely at this point that Proto-Luke transmitted the words of Jesus, "I have come to cast fire on the earth . . . I have a baptism to be baptized with. . ." (12:49f). Then follows the remarkable question, "Do you think that I have come to give peace on earth?" The reader of the gospel up to this point, remembering that the infant Jesus was proclaimed as he who had come "to guide our feet in the way of peace" (1:79), could only answer "yes". But Jesus says here, "No, I tell you, but rather division" (12:51), and we see in Jesus not the fulfilment of the promise of Mal 3:24 of uniting father and son but rather of Mic 7:6 of dividing them. This strange situation must be discussed separately together with the other passages on peace.

¹ Ibid., p. 236.

² The return of the master to punish the servant is likely to be part of the allegorical interpretation, so that the interpretation of the unusual διχοτομέω offered by O. Betz, "The Dichotomized Servant and the End of Judas Iscariot," *Rev. Qum.* 5 (1964), 43-58, is to be preferred to that of Jeremias, *Gleichnisse*, p. 49. Jeremias presupposes an underlying Aramaic פלג and would translate: "er wird ihm Schläge zuteilen und ihn als Ruchlosen behandeln." Betz points to the נכרת of 1QS II:16, in view of the parallelism of the whole phrase: "he shall be cut off from among all the sons of light . . . his lot shall be among those who are accursed forever."

We have seen how the original preaching of crisis to Israel has been transmitted as eschatological exhortation to the church. At the same time the controversies with the Pharisees show that the church was still engaged in preaching and discussion within Israel. Can we find in Proto-Luke any examples of the preaching of crisis which have been transmitted in their original form, still addressed to Israel? It will be our contention that Lk 12:54 - 13:35, addressed to the crowds, contains just such preaching, and accordingly it will be discussed below in section 5.

Lk 14:1-24 reverts to the discussion with the Pharisees, again represented as taking place while Jesus is a guest in the house of a Pharisee. There is a Sabbath controversy (Vs 1-6) and a series of sayings on humility at table (Vs 7-11). Then comes the injunction to the host to invite not his friends and those who can repay his hospitality but the poor (Vs 12-14). Here we find not only the Proto-Lucan concern for the poor, but there is added to them "the crippled, the lame, the blind", exactly the same four words that appear together in the parable of the banquet (Vs 21).¹ It is precisely those parts of the population most despised by the leaders of Palestinian society that seem to be the particular concern of Jesus and the church. This is brought out by the parable of the banquet (Vs 15-24). It is difficult not to see an allegorical trait in the fact that two different groups of people are brought into the banquet after those who were first invited refuse.² The "poor and crippled and blind and lame" from the "streets and lanes of the city" are then the Amme ha-aretz of the Jerusalem church, while the people from "the highways and hedges" will represent the Gentiles. Nevertheless it should be noted that the interest of the parable

¹ Cf. also the lame and the blind in the reply to the Baptist Lk 7:22 and in the temple Mt 21:14. Lohmeyer, *Das Evangelium des Matthäus*, Göttingen, 1958², p. 300, claims that the lame and the blind were not allowed to enter the temple, but in spite of 2 Sm 5:8 this does not seem to be true. It is true however of Qumran; cf. 1QSa II:3-10, "every person . . . paralysed in his feet or hands, lame or blind or deaf . . . let these persons not enter to take their place in the midst of the congregation," a rule which seems to apply to the whole congregation restrictions originally applicable only to the priests, Lev 21:17ff.

² Cf. Jeremias, *Gleichnisse*, pp. 37, 110ff; D. Bosch, *Die Heidenmission in der Zukunftsschau Jesu*, Zürich, 1959, pp. 124-131. Note however that Luke has nothing to compare with the extended allegory of Mt 22:1-10, which is an "Abriss der Heilsgeschichte vom Auftreten der Propheten des Alten Bundes über die Zerstörung Jerusalems bis zum Jüngsten Gericht" (Jeremias, p. 58).

does not lie with either of these groups as such but with those who were first invited and refused. Even though the Gentile mission should be mentioned, again it is as part of the preaching of the church to Israel; as Grundmann says,¹ it is an "Antwort auf die jüdische Sicherheit."

The three parables of the lost are introduced by the situation of Jesus eating with tax-collectors and sinners (Lk 15:1f). Jeremias² makes very well the point that they are all three not proclamations of the gospel itself but a justification of this gospel over against its critics. This is brought out especially by the second point of the parable of the prodigal son, the behavior of the older brother. One cannot help but notice how relevant such a parable would be to a church in which Peter eats with unclean and uncircumcized men and is therefore criticized by "the circumcision party" (Acts 11:3) and by "some believers who belonged to the party of the Pharisees" (15:5).

Luke 16 unites parables and sayings under the common theme of riches. We have had numerous occasions to note the Proto-Lucan polemic against the rich and in favor of the poor. As Manson³ points out, there are a number of traits in this chapter which indicate that the polemic was originally directed against the Sadducees. In general it simply is not true that the Pharisees were lovers of money (Vs 14), and the phrase "you are those who justify yourselves (הצטרק)" (Vs 15)⁴ might be a play on the name צדק. Further, the ending of the Lucan version of the common story of the rich man and Lazarus concerns life after death and how this is proclaimed in Moses and the prophets. The saying, "if they do not hear Moses and the prophets, neither will they be convinced if someone should rise from the dead," seems to envisage the Sadducees directly, and it evinces an almost scornful attitude to the failure of the Sadducees to heed the Christian gospel. If this was the original reference then these stories must have been transferred to the Pharisees at a time when the church was protesting their alliance with the upper classes, during the reign of Herod Agrippa.⁵

¹ *Lukas*, p. 298.

² *Gleichnisse*, pp. 113-118.

³ *Mission and Message*, pp. 587-593.

⁴ However, in the only occurrence of the Hithpael of צדק in the Hebrew Bible, Gen 44:16, Onkelos translates צדק.

⁵ The sayings in Lk 16:16-18 are very difficult. It is amazing how Conzelmann never gives a thorough exegesis of one of his key verses, "the law and

Lk 17:1-19 contains teaching for the disciples, and then comes the eschatological section 17:20 - 18:8, which we shall discuss separately. 18:9-14 is again directed against the Pharisees and in favor of the sinners and tax-collectors. There follows a story which illustrates this, that of the tax-collector Zacchaeus and the murmurers (19:1-7, 9-10). The conclusion is interesting: "today salvation has come to this house, because he too is a son of Abraham" (19:9). Proto-Luke could not make any clearer what seems to be so hard for moderns to grasp. Again and again (Lk 1:55, 73; 3:8; 13:16, 28; 16:19-31; Acts 3:25; 7:17; 13:26) he underlines the statement that salvation is for *all* the sons of Abraham but also (at least for the present) *only* for the sons of Abraham. The original point of the parable of the pounds, 19:11-27, seems to have been an injunction to share the knowledge of the revelation of God, addressed first to Israel and later to the overly cautious within the church.¹ The entry into Jerusalem and the Proto-Lucan version of the apocalyptic discourse seem to be addressed to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and will be discussed as such.

Finally, the Proto-Lucan passion story can tell us something about the attitude of the author to Israel. We are here concerned neither with the historical accuracy of the account of Jesus' trial nor with the Christological and soteriological aspects of Jesus' death, but only with what the story indicates about the relationship between the church and Israel. In view of the fact that the passion story very soon became the occasion for the church to express a violent hate toward Israel, it might seem that our task would be the simple one of showing how this is not true of Proto-Luke. In fact the matter is not so simple, as a glimpse at the early chapters of Acts and what they have to say about the responsibility for Jesus' death will show.

In the preaching of the church to the inhabitants of Jerusalem

the prophets were until John; since then the kingdom of God is preached" (for a discussion cf. the works cited p. 250, note 4), perhaps because a closer look would disagree with his thesis. The law and the prophets are here on one side of a dividing line, but John is with Jesus on the side of the gospel (ἀπὸ τῶτε). In context the saying about the law passing away may well be meant ironically (Manson, *Mission and Message*, p. 427) or even negatively (Grundmann, *Lukas*, p. 324) of the power of the law, of which the saying on divorce provides an illustration.

¹ Cf. C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, London, 1935, pp. 146-153. Vs 11 is a Lucan addition. For the incorporated story of Archelaus, cf. below, pp. 354f.

just after Jesus' death two motives would have been at work: 1. in calling the people to repentance their responsibility for Jesus' death would be emphasized, along with the accompanying word of forgiveness, and 2. in seeking to appeal to popular opinion it would be emphasized that the enemies of Jesus were the same as the enemies of the people, so that the followers of Jesus stood in solidarity with the mass of the people over against their rulers. The first motive appears most prominently in Acts, the second in the gospel.

Already in Lk 9:31; 13:31-35 Jerusalem is seen as the city which kills the prophets and accordingly as the city which kills Jesus. Acts 13:27f speaks similarly of "those who live in Jerusalem and their rulers," who fulfilled the prophets they did not understand by condemning Jesus: "though they could charge him with nothing deserving death, yet they asked Pilate to have him killed" (cf. also Acts 10:39). Usually however it is in direct address to the inhabitants of Jerusalem that they are said to have "crucified and killed (Jesus) by the hands of lawless men" (2:23; cf. 2:36; 3:13-15). Other passages are perhaps a bit different in that it is the priests and leaders of Israel who are said in a direct address to have killed Jesus (4:10; 5:28; 7:52). In dependence on Ps 2:1f, the prayer of Acts 4:27 can say quite comprehensively that Jesus' death was due to "both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the peoples (sic! from Ps 2:1) of Israel," and the next verse adds for good measure that they had done "what thy hand and thy plan had predestined to take place." Here we see the main emphasis of these early chapters of Acts as far as assigning responsibility for Jesus' death is concerned. If in connection with a martyred prophet theology it can be said that Jerusalem killed Jesus, and if in connection with Ps 2 Jesus is killed by Gentiles and peoples, kings and rulers, the main theological explanation for his death is that it occurred in accordance with the predetermined plan of God. This explanation appears in Acts 2:23; 3:18; 4:27; 13:29; and also in Lk 22:37; 24:26, 44, 46. What is said about the responsibility for Jesus' death depends then on the context in which the question is asked and on the persons addressed.

Insofar as the inhabitants of Jerusalem are addressed, they are held responsible for the death of Jesus and are called to repentance. At the same time, for this repentance to be possible there must also be the offer of forgiveness. Not only is this offer explicitly made in connection with Jesus' death, Acts 2:38, but the responsibility of

Jerusalem is excused because of ignorance: "and now, brethren, I know that you acted in ignorance as did also your rulers" (Acts 3:17; cf. 1 Cor 2:8). The saying Lk 12:10 also belongs in this connection: "every one who speaks a word against the Son of Man (Jesus during his lifetime) will be forgiven, but he who blasphemes against the Holy Spirit (the preaching of the church) will not be forgiven." This whole motif of ignorance and forgiveness is best brought out in Jesus' word from the cross, which stands significantly¹ only in Proto-Luke: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do" (Lk 23:34).

The passion story did not serve the function of proclaiming the gospel directly to Jerusalem but of explaining Jesus' death. Here it was thought helpful not only to appeal to the divine necessity of this death on the basis of the Scriptures and the prophet-martyr theology, but also to point out that the enemies of Jesus were the same as the enemies of the church. We have already remarked the tendency of Acts to want to line up Israel in two parties: on the one hand the Sadducees and temple authorities and on the other the church and the common people and hopefully the Pharisees. Similarly, the Proto-Lucan passion story emphasizes quite strongly that Jesus was put to death by the temple authorities, while the common people of Jerusalem were supporters of Jesus.² As this perspective differs considerably from the Johannine and even the Markan passion stories, it is worth demonstrating in some detail. Perhaps the clearest exposition of the situation would be simply to list all the passages in which the people (λαός) or the multitudes (πληθος, ὄχλος) are mentioned in the Jerusalem section of Proto-Luke, and then to list all the passages which mention Jesus' enemies.

- 19:37 the whole multitude (πληθος) began to rejoice and to praise God
(at Jesus' entry into Jerusalem)
- 19:48 for the whole people (λαός) clung to him listening
- 21:38 and all the people (λαός) were coming early to him on the temple
mount to hear him
- 23:5 (Jesus) stirs up the people (λαός), teaching throughout all
Judea, from Galilee even to this place

¹ This saying was found to be intolerable for many in the later church, as is shown by its omission in BDW⁶ syrsin, etc.

² It is incomprehensible to me how Conzelmann, *Mitte der Zeit*, p. 83, can find even in Luke "die Tendenz, alle Schuld auf die Juden zu legen," and this certainly does not apply to Proto-Luke.

- 23:13 the chief priests and the rulers of the people (λαός)¹
 23:14 (Jesus as) one who was perverting the people (λαός)
 23:27 there followed him a great multitude of the people (πλῆθος τοῦ λαοῦ), and of women who bewailed and lamented him
 23:35 and the people (λαός) stood by watching (at the crucifixion); but the rulers scoffed at him
 23:48 all the multitudes (ὄχλοι) who assembled to see the sight, when they saw what had taken place, returned home beating their breasts
 24:19 Jesus of Nazareth, who was a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people (λαός)

On the other hand the enemies of Jesus are clearly distinguished from the people as a whole.

- 19:47 the leaders of the people found nothing they could do (for the whole people clung to him listening)
 22:52 the chief priests and captains of the temple and elders, who had come out against him
 22:54 bringing him into the high priest's house
 22:66 the assembly of the elders of the people, both chief priests and scribes
 23:10 the chief priests and the scribes stood by (before Herod), vehemently accusing him
 23:11 Herod with his soldiers treated him with contempt and mocked him
 23:13 Pilate then called together the chief priests and the rulers of the people¹
 23:35 the rulers scoffed at him
 23:36 the soldiers also mocked him
 23:39 one of the criminals . . . railed at him
 24:10 our chief priests and rulers delivered him up to be condemned to death

There are in addition three more passages which speak of the "crowd" as enemies of Jesus. It seems to be a small mob which is envisaged and in no sense the whole population of Jerusalem. It is never called λαός, a word with connotations of the whole people of God, who are always friendly to Jesus in the passion story. Even if the distinction is not clearly brought out by word usage, these passages cannot overturn the overwhelming impression of the sayings listed above. A mob seems to be referred to in these passages.

¹ That we are to read τοῦ λαοῦ here and not καὶ τὸν λαόν, cf. G. Rau, "Das Volk in der lukanischen Passionsgeschichte, eine Konjektur zu Lk 23:13," ZNW 56 (1965), 41-51.

- 22:47 there came a crowd (ὄχλος) and the man called Judas (to arrest him)
 23:1 then the whole crowd (πλῆθος) of them arose and brought him before Pilate
 23:4 Pilate said to the chief priests and the crowds (ὄχλοι)

The Proto-Lucan passion story insists that it was the priests and the Sadducees (and their mob), the same people who were later opposing the church, who were responsible for the death of Jesus. It may be for this reason that the responsibility of Pilate is (unhistorically) minimized, for Pilate here even finds Jesus guiltless. The introduction of Herod into the story, peculiar to this gospel, is harder to explain. It seems most improbable that Ps 2:2 (Acts 4:26) would be enough to account for his presence here,¹ and yet this little episode seems to serve no real purpose in the passion story as a whole, whatever its historical accuracy. That it was important for Proto-Luke is shown by 9:7-9, a passage which prepares for this one and which therefore must be Proto-Lucan and not Markan material (cf. also Herod's attempt to kill Jesus, 13:31). A possible solution is indicated by the time of composition of the gospel. Because the Proto-Lucan church was vitally interested in Herod Agrippa who had persecuted them, therefore they are interested in Herod Antipas in the gospel. In line with this we note that it is only in Proto-Luke that Peter's protestation of loyalty mentions going to prison: "I am ready to go with you to prison and to death" (22:33; cf. Acts 12:1-19). If this is the case then it is one more indication of the tendency of the Jerusalem church to identify its own enemies with Jesus' enemies.

The above survey of the place of Israel and the Gentiles in the theology of the church behind Proto-Luke has been necessary in order to provide a background for the sayings concerning the fall of Jerusalem. It has hopefully been demonstrated that this church was engaged in a mission exclusively to Israel, but that the mission was beginning to encounter disappointments. The optimistic picture suggested by the proclamation of the birth stories is here tempered by the actual experience of the church. Much of the polemic teaching of Proto-Luke reflects the dialogue between the church and Israel, and some other teaching for the disciples seems to be a modification of preaching directed originally to non-Christian

¹ So M. Dibelius, "Herodes und Pilatus," *Botschaft und Geschichte*, I, 278-292; cf. Bultmann, *syn. Trad.*, p. 304.

Israel. It remains to be seen whether there is any teaching which still in its present form is addressed more to Israel as a whole than to the disciples specifically.

5. THE PROMISE OF PEACE AND THE THREAT OF WAR

If we have been correct in localizing Proto-Luke in the Palestinian church sometime about A.D. 50, then it is possible to understand the very ambiguous position of this gospel with respect to Israel. On the one hand, this church feels itself entrusted with the task of preaching to Israel the good news of their redemption, a redemption which when accepted would then encompass the whole world. On the other hand, enough time had elapsed for the church to be profoundly discouraged by the failure of their mission to Israel as a whole, and the bitter note of a warning of judgment began to be increasingly heard. On the one hand the joy of redemption, on the other the threat of judgment: these are of course alternatives and not to be combined. One is reminded of R. Joshua ben Levi, who commented on Zech 9:9, "Behold, your king comes to you . . . lowly and riding on an ass," and Dn 7:13, "Behold, with the clouds of heaven there came one like a son of man" by saying: "If they (Israel) are worthy, 'with the clouds (ענני) of heaven'; if they are not worthy, 'lowly (עני) and riding on an ass'" (Sanh 98a). Only in such a manner can we explain the strange use of the concept "peace" in Proto-Luke: if they are worthy and respond to our preaching, peace; if they are not worthy and reject us, then . . . For the alternative we find two different possibilities: in contexts of the persecution of the church then the persecutors are threatened with swift judgment; in contexts of preaching to Israel then the opposite of peace is seen to be war. It must be emphasized that what is involved is not a prediction but a threat and that the real interest of Proto-Luke is with the theme of peace, which he still considers a real possibility.

*Shalom*¹ is of course a religious concept, often equivalent to salvation in the broadest sense. Basically it means wholeness, not just in the sense of fullness of life for the individual but for the totality of human relationships within a community. Therefore *shalom* is equally a political concept. It is not restricted to the ab-

¹ Cf. especially J. Pedersen, *Israel*, I-II, Copenhagen, 1926, pp. 263-335; and G. von Rad, *TWNT*, II, 400-405.

sense of hostility within a group, but it includes this as a matter of course.¹ A community characterized as a perfect harmony of free persons with their Lord and with one another is a political as well as a religious goal. This political goal of peace among the nations is an important part of the eschatological hope of Israel, in which the Messiah (Is 9:2-7; Zech 9:9f; Mic 5:5) rules over a peaceful paradise (Is 2:2-4=Mic 4:1-4). The proclamation to Israel during the first century that such a long-promised goal had become a reality could not possibly ignore the troubled political situation of the time. The redemption which the Messiah has come to bring to Israel will mean peace for all Israel and peace between Israel and the nations.

The concept of visitation (פְּקֻדָּה) ² is well suited to bring out the ambivalence of the Proto-Lucan attitude to Israel. Depending on the context, it can mean that God comes to his people with good intentions or that he comes to punish their wicked deeds. Both senses of the word are found together in Zech 10:3, "I will punish (אֶפְקֹד) the goats, for Yahweh of hosts cares for (פִּקֵּד) his flock." ³ Often the visitation is referred to the final coming of God for salvation and judgment, but it can also occur within history. In the Qumran scrolls visitation as judgment is found in 1QS III:14, 18; IV:20, 26; CD VII:9; VIII:2f; XIX:6, 10-15; 1QH XIV:24; and 4QpIs^b II:2, and visitation as grace in 1QSb III:2 and perhaps 1QH I:17; XIII:10, although the latter passages seem to mean more a timeless providence. The parallelism of 1QS IV:6 and 11 is typical: as for the visitation of all who walk in the spirit of light . . . as for the visitation of all who walk in the spirit of darkness. . . . More interesting are the visitations within history, as when God visited Israel to found the community (CD I:7), or in the historical catastrophe of the "first visitation" (CD VII:21; XIX:11). The concept of visitation in Luke is this kind of historical *καιρός*, always with a good intention but in the sense of an opportunity that can be missed.

¹ Foerster, *TWNT*, II, 409-416, goes too far when he does not even consider the political component of *ἐλπίς* in the New Testament.

² Wm. C. Robinson, Jr., *Der Weg des Herrn*, pp. 55-58, recognizes the importance of this concept for Luke, even though he tends to see it in deterministic terms, thus ignoring the ambivalence inherent in the word.

³ For other OT passages, cf. Beyer, *TWNT*, II, 595-604. In the inter-testamental literature we find "visitation" in a good sense Ass. Mos. I:18, Sap. 3:7 (at the judgment), and in a bad sense Sap. 14:11; 19:15; syr Bar. 20:2.

The coming of Jesus means fundamentally the coming of peace¹ on earth to Israel, the men of God's favor (Lk 2:14). What this means specifically is shown by the *Benedictus*. God "has visited and given redemption" to Israel by raising up for them the Messiah (1:68f), or it can also be said that the Messiah, the "Branch from on high has visited us" (1:79). The purpose of this visitation is "to guide our feet in the way of peace" (1:79), which peace means "salvation from our enemies and from the hand of all who hate us . . . to make us without fear, rescued from the hand of our enemies" (1:71, 74). It is unthinkable that these lines could have been conceived without reference to Rome. The Messiah who visits his people is to sit on "the throne of his father David and rule over the house of Jacob forever" (1:32f), for he is the one "who is going to redeem Israel" (24:21) and "set up again the kingdom for Israel" (Acts 1:6). That this visitation refers to the earthly life of Jesus is shown by the exclamation of the people after the raising of the widow's son at Nain, "God has visited his people!" (Lk 7:16). But Israel as a whole did not "recognize the time of their visitation" or "the things of peace" (19:44, 42), and so Jesus was killed and the intentions of God seemed frustrated. But not so.

We have seen how Stephen's account of the life of Moses is meant typologically to refer also to the life of Jesus. We hear how Moses came "to visit (ἐπισκέψασθαι = 7קב) his brethren, the sons of Israel" (Acts 7:23ff) and how he rescued one of them who was being wronged by an Egyptian. "He thought the brethren would understand that God through his hand was giving them salvation (cf. Lk 1:68ff), but they did not understand (cf. Lk 19:42ff)." Then Moses came upon two Israelites who were quarrelling and, in a statement which goes beyond the Exodus text, tried "to reconcile them in peace (εἰς εἰρήνην), saying, 'Men, you are brothers, why do you wrong each other?'" (Acts 7:25f). But Moses was refused, and one might think that these intentions for redemption and peace had been frustrated, except that forty years later "God sent him as ruler and redeemer" (7:35). One can speak then of two visitations, the first of which ended in failure, but both of which envisage the redemption of Israel and peace.

The version of the kerygma contained in Peter's speech Acts

¹ For this whole discussion, cf. the very suggestive article by Joseph Comblin, "Le paix dans la théologie de saint Luc," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 32 (1956), pp. 439-460.

10:34ff begins with the proclamation of peace between Israel and the Gentiles. Speaking to the Gentile God-fearer Cornelius, Peter speaks of "the word which he sent to the sons of Israel proclaiming peace through Jesus Christ," or as Comblin would translate, "(En vérité je comprends) cette parole qu'il a envoyée aux fils d'Israël quand il annonçait (par Isaïe) la paix par Jésus-Christ."¹ But whether it is through Isaiah or through the preaching of the apostles the content of the good news is the same: peace between Israel and the Gentiles because Jesus "is the Lord of all" (10:36). It is interesting that we find the same statements and the same reference to Isaiah made in Rm 10, where Paul too is speaking explicitly of the mission of the church to Israel.² After the statement, "there is no distinction between Jew and Greek — the same Lord is Lord of all" (Rm 10:12), Paul like Acts 10 refers to Is 52:7, "how beautiful are the feet of those who preach good news," and then he goes on to quote Is 53:1, "Lord, who has believed what he has heard from us?" When we consider that the same passage is quoted along with Is 6:10 in Jn 12:23 and that Paul quotes Is 52:15 in Rm 15:21 in the context of justification of Gentile mission, it seems that we have hit on a testimony tradition³ concerning Jews and Gentiles in the church, in which Acts 10 represents an early stage. The passage referred to in 10:36 is as follows: "How beautiful on the mountains are the feet of him who brings good news, who proclaims peace, who brings news of good, who proclaims salvation, who says to Zion, 'Your God reigns' " (Is 52:7). The meaning of this reigning of God is that he "has redeemed Jerusalem" so that "all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God" (Is 52:9f).⁴ That Jesus is Lord of all is a commonplace of the New Testament, but that this message was a word sent to Israel is said only in Acts 10. Paul drops the reference to peace as being no longer relevant. The peace of the gospel is connected in Is 52 and Acts 10 with the redemption of Jerusalem and therefore also with the salvation of all flesh, but when Eph 2:14ff speaks of Christ as our peace who has reconciled Jew and

¹ Op. cit., p. 446.

² Cf. J. Munck, *Christus und Israel*, pp. 70-79.

³ Cf. B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, Philadelphia, 1961, pp. 86-88, 247-250.

⁴ If Proto-Luke had ascribed atoning significance to Jesus' death, he would undoubtedly have also quoted Is 53:5, "punishment leading to our peace was on him."

Gentile, the reference is to individuals only. We must not let our knowledge of what actually happened obscure the quite different expectation of the Palestinian church.

If the first visitation ended in the rejection of the offer of peace, there was still a second visitation, about which Peter was speaking to Cornelius. We hear about this second visitation in Acts 15:14, when "Symeon told how first God visited (Israel) to take from Gentiles people for his name." The visitation results in Gentiles already now coming to live in peace as part of the people for his name, and James agrees that this is in accordance with the promise, for the kingdom of David is to be rebuilt in order that the Gentiles too may seek the Lord. If Sahlin is right about the ending of the Proto-Lucan part of Acts, then the very last words 15:33 concern this theme. The brethren from Antioch, after the decision of the apostolic council which enabled Jews and Gentiles to live together in peace in the church, carried this good news back home. "They were sent off with peace by the brethren to those who had sent them." The peace which they took back to Antioch was to be sure a "*pax Israelitica*," which G. A. Danell¹ goes on to define as follows: "it will be established with Jerusalem as its centre, with the Son of David as its leader, and consequently will be under the supremacy of Israel." First the fallen hut of David must be built up, and then the Gentiles will join themselves to Israel to share in the fulfilment of the promises to Israel. Those who were outside come in, not as a new people but as part of the one people of God, all living together in the eschatological *shalom*.

Of course this did not happen in the way it was first expected. Nevertheless, what is involved is not a prediction but the offer of a promise, the other side of which is a threat. Even if the church hoped the second visitation would succeed where the first had failed, there was no guarantee that it would be so, and the words spoken about the first visitation still were relevant to the preaching of the church. When Jesus entered Jerusalem, his disciples greeted him as the one who comes with the gospel of peace, saying, "in heaven peace and glory in the highest" (Lk 19:37f). This is not to be seen as a weakening over against 2:11, "on earth peace", but rather as a prayer that the peace might now come down from heaven to earth, as at the end of the *Qaddish*, "he who makes peace in the highest, may he

¹ "The Idea of God's People in the Bible," *The Root of the Vine*, London, 1953, pp. 23-36, p. 30.

make peace for us and for all Israel.”¹ But if some had hopes that the coming of Jesus to Jerusalem would mean the coming of peace to Zion, Jesus knew otherwise. He said to Jerusalem, “if only you had recognized on this day the things of peace . . . if only you had recognized the time of your visitation” (Lk 19:42-44). Jerusalem did not recognize her visitation and the things of peace, but the implication is that she could have done so. Here in this passage, in the contrast between the words of those who welcome Jesus and his own words on Jerusalem, is seen most clearly the ambivalent use of the concept of peace in Proto-Luke.

Finally, there is no promise at all, but an absolute denial in the words of Jesus Lk 12:51f, “do you think that I have come to give peace on earth? No, I tell you, but rather division.” Here as often in Semitic thought result is expressed in terms of intention. There is a consistency in all of the Proto-Lucan passages concerning peace, and this is no exception. Paul puts it in individual terms when he says 2 Cor 2:15f, “we are the aroma of Christ to God among those who are being saved and among those who are perishing, to the one a fragrance from death to death, to the other a fragrance from life to life.” Or as he says concerning the one gospel Rm 1:17f, “in it the righteousness of God is revealed through faith for faith . . . (and in it) the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and wickedness of men.” But Proto-Luke is thinking of Israel as a whole when he says that the one word of the gospel means either peace or no peace. What is threatened as the alternative of peace is made clear in the section immediately following the words “not peace but rather division.”

The material we have investigated so far in Proto-Luke has either been teaching for the disciples or polemic against the Pharisees. The section Lk 12:54 - 13:9, beginning with “he also said to the crowds,” contains material which is addressed directly to the situation of Israel as a nation, and it seems that this is true also for the rest of chapter 13.² It is possible that there is another such block in Lk 17:20 - 18:8 and in the Proto-Lucan accounts of the entry into Jerusalem and the eschatological discourse. This is in itself a sign of the earliness of the material, for the general tendency of the

¹ W. Staerk, *Altjüdische liturgische Gebete*, p. 31. Cf. the previous petition: “may there be great peace from heaven and life for us and for all Israel.”

² “Wir haben es in dem Kapitel Lk 13 durchgehend mit Jerusalem und den Juden zu tun,” Flender, *Heil und Geschichte*, p. 101.

gospel tradition is to apply everything to the situation of the church. What has been preserved of the preaching to Israel in Luke is as it happens all couched in terms of a prophetic warning. To keep it in perspective, we should also remember the proclamation of peace as this can still be heard in Lk 1-2.

The early teaching of the church concerning the last judgment is very consistent in emphasizing its suddenness and unpredictability, as we saw especially in connection with the three parable fragments Lk 12:35-40. This means that whenever signs are mentioned something else was originally in view. This is of course only a slight difference in emphasis. For us the catastrophe of A.D. 70 is an historical event of the past, while the judgment is a supernatural event still expected in the future. This would not have been the case for Jesus or the church before the year 70. Insofar as they could analyse the political situation of their own time, it was not hard to see that ever since Judas of Galilee and increasingly so since the disturbances of A.D. 40 Jerusalem was on a collision course with Rome. Only if the nation as a whole changed its policy completely and "recognized the things of peace" could this be avoided. At the same time Israel faced an even greater crisis brought about by the coming of the Messiah (Lk 2:34f), and here the threat was the final judgment itself. It is doubtful if the two were separated in Jesus' mind, and they certainly are not separated in the tradition. It is only a matter of emphasis, of the tone used in speaking of what is coming, that gives a clue to making any distinction at all. Nevertheless, such a distinction is necessary, as we shall see.¹ The saying Lk 12:54-56, which contrasts the ability of people to predict the weather from the state of the sky with their inability to interpret the present time, is eschatological in that it calls for decision in the present crisis.² At the same time people are urged not just to be

¹ G. Braumann, "Die Lukanische Interpretation der Zerstörung Jerusalems," *NT* 6 (1963), 120-127, quite correctly wants to separate the motifs of the persecution of the church and the parousia on the one hand from the destruction of Jerusalem on the other, but he wrongly wants to connect this latter with the death of Jesus.

² When G. Klein, "Die Prüfung der Zeit (Lukas 12, 54-56)," *ZThK* 61 (1964), 373-390, claims that Luke has de-eschatologized the more apocalyptic version Mt 16:2f, his conclusion is based more on Conzelmann's general observations concerning Luke than on an exegesis of this passage alone. As for his claim that Luke has applied this along with Vs 57-59 to the life of the church (cf. Mt 5:25f), he misses the whole significance of this section.

prepared for a sudden and unexpected end but to analyse and interpret the present situation and act accordingly. The reference seems to be national and political.

The parable of the man going to court, 12:57-59, also concerns the necessity for prompt action in the present crisis. As opposed to the version in Mt 5:25f, which urges individual Christians to be reconciled with their enemies, these words are addressed to the crowds.¹ They should not follow the example of their leaders ("why do you not judge for yourselves what is right?") but should try now to be reconciled with their oppressors before disaster strikes. As the words ἄρχων and πλάτωρ show, the text is thinking in terms of a Roman court. The warning therefore is not just a general one to be reconciled before the judgment of God but in context it means specifically to be reconciled as a nation with Rome, and thus to escape the consequences of their present disastrous course.

The stories of the massacred Galileans and the tower of Siloam, Lk 13:1-5, should not be interpreted in general terms of the relationship between sin and suffering. Nor can they be a warning of the last judgment, because it is emphasized that those who were killed were not especially guilty. The point of the two incidents is summed up in the double refrain, "unless you repent you will all likewise perish." The point of the comparison might be thought to lie in the intention of those killed. The first incident concerns the Galileans "whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices." As the character of Pilate is well known and the Galileans were particularly susceptible of Zealotism, there seems to be nothing improbable in the account. These Galileans who were plotting a revolt were no different from the rest of the Galileans, and if the rest of the Galileans persist they too will be killed by the Roman armies ("you will *all* perish"). Those on whom the tower in Siloam fell, who were also engaged in a revolt (?), were no different from the rest of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and if they persist they too will be killed by the Roman armies. Thus all of Israel, both Galilee and Jerusalem, would be warned not to join the movement of the Zealots lest they meet disaster. Such an understanding has much in its favor, but there are also great difficulties. The crime of desecrating the temple by killing people while they were actually involved in sacrifice is so heinous that one cannot understand why Josephus should not have included it in his catalogue of Pilate's crimes, Ant. XVIII, 55-89.

¹ Cf. J. Jeremias, *Gleichnisse*, pp. 32f.

It also seems to be presupposed that the lay Galileans were themselves offering sacrifice, a situation which would have been possible only at Passover. If we are to assume a real historical situation, there are two possibilities, both of which tell against this being a genuine saying of Jesus. Faced with a revolt during Passover 4 B.C., Archelaus sent his army into the temple and killed 3000 people, "who were busy with their sacrifices."¹ Or, if we are to keep the reference to Pilate, we can suppose that the original story spoke of the Samaritans who were killed in A.D. 36 on the slopes of Mt. Gerizim.² With respect to the tower of Siloam, the parallelism seems to require some connection with Pilate, and we can perhaps suppose that the tower collapsed during the tumult which arose over Pilate taking temple money to make repairs on the aqueduct.³ Whatever the origin of these reports, when we ask how they are used in the present text, the point of comparison is in the manner of the deaths of those killed: "unless you repent you will all *likewise* perish." Unless you repent as a nation, you will be massacred by Roman soldiers or you will be crushed under the falling walls of Jerusalem. It is doubtful if we can go any further than this. In particular, speculation about the motives of those who brought the report to Jesus, whether they were Pharisees or Zealots, and what answer they expected to elicit from him, is completely fruitless. As the story is now told it makes only the point that the nation must repent or perish in an armed conflict with Rome.

In the parable of the fig tree in the vineyard, 13:6-9, one cannot help think of Israel.⁴ Even without going into an allegorical interpretation, the parable surely reflects the missionary situation of the Palestinian church. Although they are discouraged about the relative failure of their mission and the fact that Israel was bearing no fruit, they beg for just one last opportunity before despairing of their task as hopeless. "Lord, leave it also this year" is the point of the parable. If, as is probable, the story of the withered fig tree Mk 11:12ff is a development of this parable, it is significant how Mark reflects a later situation: now the time is up, and as the fig

¹ Josephus, B. J. II, 13; cf. Ant. XVII, 216f.

² Ant. XVIII, 85-87. However, nothing is said of their offering sacrifice, and as they were cut off during their ascent of the mountain, one would have to interpret the Lucan expression to mean that their blood was mixed with that of their sacrificial animals, also killed in the battle.

³ Ant. XVIII, 60-62; B. J. II, 175-177.

⁴ Cf. Is 5:1-7 and the passages listed above, p. 312 note 1.

tree still has borne no fruit it is cursed. In the Proto-Lucan version there is still a chance for repentance, and Israel is exhorted to bear fruit before it is too late.

The Sabbath healing Lk 13:10-17 and the parables of the kingdom of God 13:18-21 refer to Israel only by virtue of their position in Lk 13. We note that the woman was healed because she was a daughter of Abraham (cf. 16:22; 19:9) and that while Jesus' adversaries were put to shame, all the people rejoiced at his action. The parable of the leaven, originally spoken to the disciples together with the parable of the mustard seed, could in its present context be interpreted of the role the Palestinian church hoped to play in Israel as a whole: i.e. the small group would leaven (used here in a good sense) the whole of the nation.

Jesus' reply to Herod, 13:31-33, contains many difficulties, but we are here concerned only with the statement that a prophet must die nowhere but in Jerusalem. It may be that it is because of the word Jerusalem connected with the killing of prophets that this section, which seems to contain an old tradition,¹ has been inserted in its present position. Flender² points out that 13:34 seems to be a direct continuation from 13:30, since both contain a direct address to Israel. Luke however wanted to generalize the statement about the last being first and the first last and deliberately broke the connection with the words against Jerusalem. If this is the case, then we have in Lk 13 two sections which contain the preaching of the church directly to Israel, besides Lk 12:54-13:9 now also 13:23-30, 34-35.

The words about being excluded from the kingdom, 13:23-30, were definitely addressed to Israel from the very beginning, and this collection of originally isolated sayings was probably made for that purpose. The picture of the judgment with Jesus acting as door-keeper to the temple is unusual enough to be a genuine saying of Jesus. At that time it will not be enough for people to say to him, "we ate before you and we drank, and in our streets you taught," a phrase which shows decisively that it is the Israel of Jesus' time which is here envisaged. But membership in Israel is not enough, cf. 3:8, "God is able from these stones to raise up children to

¹ If we had to find a place in Proto-Luke where these words could originally have stood, the most appropriate would be perhaps just before 9:51.

² *Heil und Geschichte*, p. 101.

Abraham," and more remotely Rm 9:6f, "not all who are from Israel are Israel, nor because they are the seed of Abraham are they all children." No, the "workers of iniquity" will have to look on from outside during the Messianic banquet with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and the prophets, while people will come from east and west and north and south to join in the banquet. If the quotation from Ps 107:3 is intentional the reference will be to the diaspora, but otherwise the Gentiles could be meant. It is not possible to make a decision because the point of the saying concerns not those who come but those who are excluded. It is a call to them to repent.

The lament over Jerusalem, 13:34-35, contains the tradition of early Christian prophets. In this it is very similar to Lk 11:49-51, although as we saw there is no need to assume that the two passages were once joined. Burney¹ has pointed out how well an Aramaic translation would fit into a *Qinah* rhythm, a fact that we shall try to indicate in the translation.

Jerusalem, Jerusalem, who kills the prophets
and stōnes your mēssengers,
How mǎny times have I lōnged
to gǎther your children
As a hēn gǎthers her chicks
 under her wings.
But you would not!
Behōld there is lēft for yōu
 your hōuse a desolātion.
I tell you, you will not see me until the time comes when you say:
"Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord."

As the break in rhythm shows, it seems that we are dealing with three originally separate sayings, which however must have been joined at an early time. The first represents the words of a Christian prophet speaking in the name of God, as the theme of the killing of the prophets shows. It is interesting that a parallel version of this lament should have been transmitted as a saying of God in 5 Es 1:28ff, "Thus says the Lord, the Almighty: . . . I gathered you together as a hen gathers her chicks under her wing. But now, what shall I do to you? I will cast you forth from my presence. . . . Thus says the Lord, the Almighty: Your house is desolate; I will drive you forth as the wind does stubble." The reference to God gathering

¹ *Poetry*, p. 146. For the sake of the rhythm he reads ἐπισυνάγει after ὅρως as in Mt 23:37.

people under his wing has nothing to do with a wisdom myth but is a common Old Testament figure of speech.¹ In the Proto-Lucan text the speaker is the risen Christ, and the many times he longed to gather Jerusalem does not refer to the Old Testament or Jesus' lifetime but to the evangelization of the Jerusalem church.² The saying presupposes not only the fact of this later mission but also its failure. Nevertheless, it was spoken at a time when the attempt was still being made, as the direct address shows.

After the reproach comes the threat, and this is the line which is most difficult to interpret. It is not sure whether we should read the word ἐρημός, and the interpretation of the "house" is uncertain. The forsaken house is often taken to refer to the temple, which has been forsaken by the Shekinah. This would fit in with the previous image of the wings of the Shekinah, and one could refer to Josephus, B.J. VI, 299f; Tacitus, Hist. V, 13; syr Bar 8:2, where the Shekinah is said to leave the temple before its destruction, as it did the first temple Ezek 10.³ If we are also to read the word "desolate", then it is said in addition that the temple will be destroyed. The chief difficulty with this interpretation is that the phrase "house of Jerusalem" is exceedingly strange as a designation of the temple. Accordingly we shall have to take the house along with many interpreters⁴ as a designation for the city as a whole. For the sake of the rhythm, we have assumed that the word ἐρημός read by many MSS was original; however equally good MSS omit it, and it is not at all certain that the rhythm continues in the second saying. That

¹ Dt 32:11; Ps 17:8; 36:7; 57:1; 61:4; 63:7; 91:4; Is 31:5; Ruth 2:12.

² S. G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church*, London, 1957,² says aptly p. 41, "since the Synoptic tradition only records one visit of Jesus to Jerusalem, it would seem, therefore, that the saying here rather expresses the mind of his followers, who had continued for many years without notable success his work of evangelizing the inhabitants of the Holy City," but he then goes on to argue for the creation of the saying as part of the church's apologetic after the fall of Jerusalem.

³ This is the interpretation given by Haenchen, "Matthäus 23," *ZThK* 48 (1951), 38-63, p. 56.

⁴ Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, I, 944, "Wo בית in der Bedeutung 'Tempel' ein Suffix bei sich hat, bezieht sich dieses immer auf Gott . . . Danach ist 'euer Haus' Mt 23:38 nicht der Tempel, sondern 'euer Gemeinwesen'." Goguel, "La parole de Jésus sur la destruction et la reconstruction du temple," *Jubilé Alfred Loisy*, I, Paris, 1928, pp. 117-136, p. 120f, "L'emploi du pronom exclut qu'il puisse être question du Temple. C'est de la ville dans son ensemble qu'il s'agit, le Temple y étant vraisemblablement compris." Cf. Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit*, Göttingen, 1962, p. 113. Michel, *TWNT* V, 127, is uncertain.

it makes no difference to the meaning is shown by two passages of Jeremiah, either of which could have influenced our passage. Jer 12:7 reads, "I have forsaken my house,¹ I have abandoned my heritage, I have given the beloved of my soul into the hands of her enemies." Jer 22:5ff reads, "But if you will not heed these words, I swear by myself, says the Lord, that this house shall become a desolation . . . surely I will make you a desert, an uninhabited city . . . and many nations will pass by this city, and every man will say to his neighbor, 'Why has the Lord dealt thus with this great city?' " (cf. 6:8, "be warned, O Jerusalem . . . lest I make you a desolation, an uninhabited land"). Even the allusion to the Shekinah in the previous reproach does not tell against an interpretation of the city, for we have seen that the presence of God was not restricted to the temple but was also associated with Zion as a whole. When we consider that Proto-Luke otherwise shows no interest in the fate of the temple, it seems most probable that we should include Lk 13:35 among the Proto-Lucan predictions of the destruction of Jerusalem.²

The third saying, that Jerusalem will not see Jesus until the parousia, is interesting because it makes a distinction between the fall of Jerusalem and the last day. The Christology is in accordance with the rest of Proto-Luke, cf. Acts 3:19-21, "repent therefore and turn again . . . that God may send the Christ appointed for you, Jesus, whom heaven must receive until the time of the restoration of all things." As the sending of the Christ in Acts 3 may refer to a sending before the parousia, so here too the one who comes³ may come as the Holy Spirit in the preaching of the church. In this case, however, the reference to "seeing" Jesus does seem to indicate that the parousia is meant. It is not an important point, because the emphasis of the saying is on the call to repentance. The use of the same words from Ps 118:26 as in the entry into Jerusalem, Lk 19:38, seems to indicate that the situation of the one coming is the same here as there. The words are meant as a joyous reception of the one who comes in the name of the Lord.⁴ Nevertheless, it is a bit mis-

¹ That the word house does not refer to the temple here is shown by the parallel נחלה, cf. Volz, *Der Prophet Jeremiah*, Leipzig, 1922, p. 144.

² It is interesting that Cyprian, *Testimonies* 1:6, should quote this passage as a testimony for the destruction of Jerusalem along with Is 1:7-9, beginning "your country lies desolate, your cities are burned with fire . . ."

³ The words "he who comes (in the name of the Lord)" seem to be a Messianic designation for Proto-Luke; cf. 7:19; 19:38.

⁴ This must be emphasized against Bultmann, *syn. Trad.*, p. 121, who thinks of an appearance to judgment as in Mt 24:30; Rev 1:7.

leading to speak of this verse as only a pious hope for Israel at the end.¹ In Proto-Luke it was never questioned whether the Messiah would come for Israel, but by making the coming dependent on Israel's prior repentance and readiness to receive him, the saying is in this sense a threat. This threat expresses clearly the nature of all the threats to Israel in this gospel: it serves to call Israel to repentance, but God forbid that Israel should not repent and the threat become a reality. Here in particular it is not said that Israel will not experience joyfully the parousia *because* they have not repented, nor even that they will not experience it *unless* they repent, but that they will not experience it *until* they repent. The saying has a parenetic function, but the underlying assumption is not one of rejection but of salvation for Israel. Here then in Lk 13:34-35 is an example of the church calling Israel to repentance with one threat for not responding, the fall of Jerusalem, and with another threat which involves a promise, the parousia of Jesus whom they will not see until they repent.

If the sections we have just discussed, Lk 12:54-13:9; 13:23-30, 34f, were quite clearly addressed to Israel, the case for also including Lk 17:20-18:8 under this category is much more problematical. In general it has not been necessary for our rough purposes to distinguish clearly between the non-Markan portions of Luke and the original version of Proto-Luke. We shall have to do so at this point. Even when we have recovered the Proto-Lucan text we still will not have arrived at the warning of the fall of Jerusalem which perhaps lies in the background of Lk 17. Although it is not essential to our thesis, the task of analysing this section will perhaps illumine a number of points.

The most careful exposition of the present text of Lk 17:20-24 is that of B. Noack,² who in many respects provided the basis for Conzelmann's broader study. Noack establishes at great length that ἐντός must mean "among" and that it was not understood as "within" until the eighteenth century. The kingdom of God is present in the person of Jesus. This statement in Vs 21 is a fundamental postulate of Lucan theology, over against which he wants to present the present situation of the church, Vs 22ff; it describes

¹ G. Schrenk, *Die Weissagung über Israel im Neuen Testament*, Zürich, 1951, p. 16f., implies that this promise is only a weak synoptic equivalent of Rm 11:25f; cf. Goppelt, *Christentum und Judentum*, p. 70.

² *Das Gottesreich bei Lukas; Eine Studie zu Luk. 17, 20-24*, Uppsala, 1948.

the "glückliche Gegenwart als hellen Hintergrund der schweren und gefährvollen Zukunft."¹ The kingdom of God is present when Jesus is present, but the time will come when Jesus is not present and the disciples will "desire to see one of the days of the Son of Man." They will long for the parousia when the kingdom of God will come, but since this kingdom was present during the lifetime of Jesus, this too can be spoken of as the days of the Son of Man. Thus Luke makes a sharp distinction between the time of Jesus and the time of the church, the time between the first and second appearances of the kingdom of God.²

Noack's exposition may very well represent Luke's own conception, and we shall simply have to overlook the unfortunate conjunction of the singular day and the plural days. However, this usage conceals a host of problems, which are usually passed over by exegetes all too rapidly.³ It has been suggested that "the days of the Son of Man" are parallel to "the days of the Messiah",⁴ but this latter is a quite different conception, referring to a king reigning on earth and having no connection with the day of judgment. More frequent is the suggestion that we have here a parallel to "the day of the Lord"⁵ in the phrase "the day of the Son of Man". The decisive objection against this is that in fact the words "the day of the Son of Man" never appear in just this form, and besides the conception would be without parallel in the New Testament.⁶

¹ Noack, p. 44.

² Noack, p. 49f, gives the following paraphrase of the passage: "Die Pharisäer fragten ihn: wann kommt das Reich Gottes? Er antwortete ihnen: auf das Kommen des Reiches braucht man nicht zu warten (indem man danach ausschaut), man kann auch nicht zweifeln, ob es hier oder dort sei; denn dass Reich Gottes ist mitten unter euch. Er sprach aber zu seinen Jüngern: es wird bald eine Zeit kommen, da der König des Reiches nicht da ist, und da man das Reich nicht sehen kann. Ihr werdet euch dann nach einem einzigen Tag der kommenden Herrschaft des Menschensohnes sehnen; ihr werdet ihn aber nicht erleben. Wenn man euch dann sagt, Er sei hier oder dort, so gehet nicht hin und sucht ihn nicht auf. Denn wenn der Menschensohn kommt, wird er wie der Blitz von einem Ende des Himmels bis zum anderen leuchten."

³ The best discussion of the problems involved is to be found in A.J.B. Higgins, *Jesus and the Son of Man*, London, 1964, pp. 82-91.

⁴ Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, II, p. 237; Grundmann, *Lukas*, p. 343.

⁵ Manson, *Mission and Message*, p. 434; Dodd, *Parables*, p. 83.

⁶ Leaney, *Luke*, pp. 68-72, tries to justify the usage of both singular and plural by saying that while the former is comparable to the day of the Lord, the plural designates such days as the transfiguration, the resurrection the ascension, the appearances, etc. Flender, *Heil und Geschichte*, p. 88, more plausibly points to the days of Jesus being taken up (Lk 9:51) and the

There is simply no way to unify the various Lucan phrases, which can be listed as follows:

Vs 22 one of the days of the Son of Man

Vs 24 the Son of Man in his day (Mt — the parousia of the Son of Man)

Vs 26 the days of the Son of Man (Mt — the parousia of the Son of Man)

Vs 30 the day when the Son of Man is revealed

If we look at the material which these phrases are supposed to illustrate, we find the following periods and points of time envisaged:

1. the days of Jesus' lifetime
2. the days of daily activity in the time of Noah or Lot or the church
3. the day on which this activity comes to an end, the judgment

Of these meanings, 1 seems to be indicated by the phrase in Vs 22, 2 by the phrase in Vs 26, and 3 by the phrase in Vs 24 and 30. In the face of such inconsistency we must try to determine how much is due to the editorial activity of Luke.

Vs 22 not only expresses a special conception of Lucan theology in the unusual phrase "the days of the Son of Man" to designate Jesus' lifetime, but it also is a clear expression of the delay of the parousia.¹ "You will desire to see one of the days, but you *will not* see it." (Contrast e.g. Mk 9:1, "some will see the kingdom of God come with power.") A reasonable assumption is that the whole verse is a Lucan creation. If we omit it, then Vs 21 is followed immediately by Vs 23, both of which contain the phrases about "see here" and "see there". While Noack's exposition of "the kingdom of God in the midst of you" may apply to Luke's theology, it involves an unusual understanding of the kingdom of God, and the most natural interpretation is that of Bultmann: the kingdom does not come with signs, but all of a sudden it will be in your midst.²

"times of refreshing" (Acts 3:19) as parallels to the "days of the Son of Man" representing the present age. But the plural in Lk 17:22 cannot be interpreted in this way.

¹ It is strange that Conzelmann, *Mitte der Zeit*, pp. 111ff, does not notice this.

² *Syn. Trad.*, p. 128. Manson, *Mission and Message*, p. 596, characterizes the sense very well: "one moment the world is just its normal self: then lo! the kingdom of God is among you." Cf. also Creed, *Luke*, p. 219.

This gives to Vs 21 the content of Vs 23f: the suddenness of the coming of the kingdom. It is probable that in Proto-Luke the two verses, now separated by Luke's introduction of Vs 22, were part of the same sentence, as not only the sense but also the doubling of one phrase shows.

Vs 26 compares the days of the Son of Man to the days of Noah. The only way to understand this is to say with Manson,¹ " 'Days of the Son of Man' is not the plural of 'Day of the Son of Man', but a poetic way of describing the last days of the existing order." He is right that this must be the sense, but there is absolutely no precedent, poetical or otherwise, for so designating the present age. We therefore conclude that Proto-Luke read simply "in those days".

Vs 24 and 30 refer to the parousia, but the phrasing is peculiar. Vs 30 is an ending to the section about Lot, but "the day on which the Son of Man is revealed" comes as an anticlimax. The story of Lot really ends just as does the parallel story of Noah with the statement that all were destroyed. When we note in addition that *κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ* is an idiomatic Greek phrase, it is apparent that Vs 30 is a Lucan creation.² Vs 24 says that "the Son of Man in his day" will be like lightning. If it had said that the coming of the Son of Man or something of the sort would be like lightning we could understand it, for what is meant is the sudden appearance of the day of judgment. It is therefore probable that the Son of Man has been added here too and that Proto-Luke read simply "on that day".

E. Schweizer³ has shown that of all the sayings concerning the Son of Man those referring to the parousia are the latest and most uncertain. Of the two *Sitze im Leben* of synoptic eschatology, the preaching of crisis for Israel and the preaching of consolation for the persecuted, the Son of Man belongs decisively in the latter. With the omission of Vs 22, however, Lk 17:20ff is seen to be addressed to the Pharisees. While one can understand why from Luke's perspective that day in the future should be associated with the Son of Man just as were the days of Jesus' earthly life, the title in all four passages must be assumed to be his creation. Just as in Mt 16:28 as compared to Mk 9:1 the Son of Man has been inserted into a saying originally referring to the kingdom of God, so here too

¹ *Mission and Message*, p. 435.

² So Higgins, *Son of Man*, p. 85.

³ "Der Menschensohn (Zur eschatologischen Erwartung Jesu)," *ZNW* 50 (1959), 185-209 = *Neotestamentica*, Zürich, 1963, pp. 56-84.

Proto-Luke spoke of the suddenness of the coming of the kingdom of God and not of the Son of Man at all.

Vs 25 and 33 are recognized by most interpreters to be secondary additions to their present context, the former being based on the three Markan predictions of the passion ¹ and the latter on Mk 8:35. On the other hand, Vs 36 may have been omitted by many MSS because some pedantic scribe thought it inappropriate that men should be in a field at night. As Luke never allows Jesus to be addressed by the disciples as διδάσκαλε, it is likely that he has made the change to κύριε in Vs 37 when the discourse was understood as being addressed to the disciples. In accordance with the above we can now suggest that the Proto-Lucan form of Lk 17:20-37 was as follows:

- 20 When he was asked by the Pharisees when the kingdom of God
 would come, he answered them and said: "The kingdom of God does
 23 not come with signs to be observed, and when they say: See, there;
 24 see, here, do not go or follow. For as the lightning which lightens
 from under the heaven to under the heaven, so will it be on that day.
 26 And as it was in the days of Noah, so it will be in those days.
 27 They ate, they drank, they married, they were given in marriage,
 until the day when Noah went up into the ark. And the flood came
 and destroyed them all.
 28 Similarly, as it was in the days of Lot (so it will be in those days).
 They ate, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they
 29 built. But on the day when Lot went out of Sodom, it rained fire
 and brimstone from heaven and destroyed them all.
 31 On that day he who is on the roof with his goods in the house
 should not come down to take them, and he who is in the field
 32 should likewise not turn back behind him. Remember Lot's wife.
 34 I tell you, on that night there will be two in one bed: the one
 35 will be taken and the other abandoned. There will be two grinding
 36 together: the one will be taken and the other abandoned. There will
 be two in the field: the one will be taken and the other abandoned."
 37 And they answered and said to him, "Where, teacher?" He said
 to them: "Where the body is, there will the vultures (eagles) be
 gathered."

So conceived, the speech fits in with what we have seen of the eschatology of the early church in such passages as Lk 12:35-39. It is always an eschatology of suddenness. Insofar as it appears in contexts emphasizing the crisis of the present, whether addressed to Israel or the disciples, that which will suddenly come is the Old

¹ In Proto-Luke it is not the Son of Man but the Christ who must suffer.

Testament Day of the Lord, the time of judgment for which one must be prepared. In the days of Noah and Lot people lived their lives without discerning the times, with no thought for what might come, and suddenly they were overwhelmed by catastrophe. So it will be with the present generation too if they do not repent, for the day of judgment will be on them suddenly like lightning, with no possibility of calculating its coming, and one will be taken and the other abandoned.¹ We should perhaps be content with having recovered the original Proto-Lucan form, which is consistent in itself and with the rest of the gospel, but there are details which seem to point to a still earlier understanding.

We have seen how closely the eschatological and the political are allied in the preaching of the church to Israel, warning the nation what will happen if they do not repent. It is possible that here too we have words applied to the judgment which were originally conceived with respect to a military disaster in Jerusalem. Glasson² has pointed out how the day which brings to a close the days of Noah and the days of Lot is always described in terms of the survivors: it is "the day when Noah went up into the ark" or "the day when Lot went out of Sodom." While it is possible to escape a military defeat, this would hardly be applicable to the day of judgment. Vs 31 in particular cannot have originally been framed with the judgment in mind, for here people are urged to flee.³ The catastrophe will come so suddenly that they will not have time to go back into the city from the fields or even into the house from the roof, but nevertheless if they act promptly they will be able to flee, just as Lot was able to flee a doomed city. The injunction to remember Lot's wife seems to connect the two sayings. It may be that there was once a series of sayings of Jesus concerning the coming war in Jerusalem which were based on an exposition of the story of Lot.⁴

¹ Glasson, *The Second Advent*, London, 1947f, p. 88, and J. A. T. Robinson, *Jesus and His Coming*, London, 1957, p. 75, both refer to Gen 7:23, "only Noah was left and those that were with him in the ark." But there the verb is וישאר = κατελείφθη, while in Luke it is ἀφίημι = Aram. שבק.

² *Second Advent*, p. 87f.

³ It is then not very clear when Higgins, *Son of Man*, p. 89, says, "it is implied that sudden though it will be, the faithful will not lack the opportunity of escape any more than did Noah and his people." There is a great difference between escaping condemnation and fleeing.

⁴ The story of Noah would then have been composed in parallel terms in order to speak of the judgment in terms of water and fire (cf. 12:49f).

Again in Vs 37 there is a statement which, while it makes sense in its present context, could have been formulated only in reference to Rome. "Where the body is, there will the vultures (eagles) be gathered." The image is of a vulture coming to eat carrion; cf. in relation to the destruction of Jerusalem Jer 7:33, "the dead bodies of this people will be food for the birds of the air" or Hos 8:1, "a vulture is over the house of the Lord." In the Aramaic text stood undoubtedly נשרא, which can mean vulture but which means primarily eagle. One cannot really speak of a double meaning, for the one word נשרא designates both the kind of bird which eats carrion and the Roman military symbol, and it is not sure if a real distinction was made between what is for us two quite different birds. That the latter is also intended in the present text is shown by the fact that the translator did not use the Greek word for vulture γύψ but rather the word for eagle ἀετός. That the eagle was well known as a symbol of Rome at this period is shown by such texts as 1QpHab 111:11 ("the Kittim come to eat up all peoples like a נשר"), Ass Mosis 10:8 with Charles' emendation, the eagle vision in 4 Es 11f, Sib 111:611, and perhaps the affair of the golden eagle on the temple, B.J. I, 650-3; Ant. XVII, 151-5. Not only is a judgment threatened against Israel with these words, but it seems plain that the executors of the judgment will be the Romans.

In its present context, where the parable of the unjust judge Lk 18:1-8 is spoken to the disciples, the point seems to be that the parousia will vindicate the persecuted disciples. However, there was no mention of persecution in the preceding sayings, and in Proto-Luke they were addressed not to the disciples but to the Pharisees. The second conclusion, "when the Son of Man comes will he find faith on earth?" is clearly secondary. If it was once an independent saying not created by Luke, it would refer most naturally to the first coming of Jesus, for at the parousia it is too late to look for faith. The real conclusion is the first: "will not God vindicate his elect, he who hears them patiently when they cry to him day and night? I tell you, he will vindicate them suddenly."¹ In the Proto-Lucan context, the elect will have been not just the disciples but all Israel with respect to their adversary Rome. This is part of "the things of peace" (19:42), that Israel not only love their enemies

¹ For the translation cf. Jeremias, *Gleichnisse*, p. 135, and Bornhäuser, *Studien*, p. 167f.

(6:27ff) but also endure patiently, knowing that their vindication from God is at hand.

It is generally recognized that in the Lucan version of the parable of the pounds Lk 19:11-27 there has been included another story of quite different character. If we isolate those elements which are foreign to the parable of the pounds, we have something like this:

12 A certain nobleman travelled to a distant country to acquire
14 for himself kingship and then return. But his countrymen hated him
and sent an embassy after him, saying: we do not want this one to
15a be king over us. And it happened when he returned after acquiring
the kingship (that he rewarded one who had remained loyal to him
with "authority over ten cities" (17) and another with authority
27 "over five cities" (19).) (And he said:) "But those enemies of mine
who did not want me to be king over them, bring them here and
slaughter them before my eyes."

The similarity of the story of the nobleman to the real story of Archelaus (Ant. XVII, viii-xiii; B.J. II, i-vi) has long been noted, and particularly the embassy of complaining citizens is a striking parallel (Ant. XVII, 300; B.J. II, 80). But even if the story of Archelaus has been inserted into the parable and the allegorical application to the coming of Jesus to judgment is clearly secondary, it is not immediately certain what should be concluded. Jeremias¹ speaks of a "Gleichnis vom Thronprätendenten" and Robinson² of a "parable of the Prince Royal", and they both then generalize in terms of the parables of crisis: the kingdom of God means judgment so be warned and prepared now. Against this view we must insist that the story has none of the form-critical indications of a parable,³ and that the story unlike most parables refers to a real historical event. It is not demonstrable that the story of Archelaus entered the gospel tradition because Jesus himself spoke of it, but this is a reasonable assumption. We have already seen in connection with Lk 13:1f that Jesus may have referred to an event from the reign of Archelaus to serve as a warning. Here too it is possible that Jesus used the example of the unsuccessful protest against the rule of Archelaus in 4 B.C. to make the point that a rebellion against Herod Antipas or the Roman authorities could only end in a similar

¹ *Gleichnisse*, pp. 50-52.

² *Jesus and His Coming*, pp. 67f.

³ Cf. Bultmann, *syn. Trad.*, p. 190, "kaum ein ursprüngliches Gleichnis, sondern eine ganz sekundäre Allegorie." We can agree with the negative characterization, but why should a real historical story be called an allegory?

disaster. We can then perhaps deduce from the presence of the Archelaus story one more indication of Jesus' position with respect to the political situation of his own time. However it tells us nothing about Proto-Luke, who has seemingly interpreted the story allegorically in connection with the parable of the pounds. As we are at present most interested in the direct proclamation of the Palestinian church to Israel, we shall return to the text of Proto-Luke.

The most important example of the preaching of the Palestinian church to the crisis of Israel is found in the Proto-Lucan versions of the entry into Jerusalem Lk 19 and the eschatological discourse Lk 21. The importance of these passages has been greatly obscured by the insertion of Markan material concerning Jesus' controversies in Jerusalem between the two, and by the modifications Luke introduced from Mark in Lk 21. The Proto-Lucan version was as follows:

- 19:37 As he was coming near, already at the descent of the Mount of Olives, the whole multitude of his disciples began to rejoice and to praise God in a loud voice for all the mighty works which they
38 had seen, saying:
 Blessed is he who comes
 in the name of the Lord.
 In heaven peace,
 and glory in the highest!
- 39 And some (of the Pharisees) of the crowd said to him, "Teacher,
40 forbid your disciples." And he answered and said, "I tell you, if
41 they are silent, the stones will cry out." And as he neared and
42 saw the city, he wept over it, saying:
 If only you too had recognized on this day the things of peace!
 But now it is hidden from your eyes.
- 43 For days shall come over you,
 and your enemies will set up a siege mound around you
 and surround you and hem you in on every side
44 and raze you to the ground—and your children in you—
 and they will not leave stone on stone in you
 because you did not recognize the time of your visitation.
- 47 And he was daily on the temple mount teaching, and the leaders
48 of the people found nothing they could do, for the whole people
21:5 clung to him listening. And as some spoke of the temple area,
 how it was adorned with beautiful stones and votive offerings, he
6 said: "That which you see, days are coming, and they will not
7 leave stone on stone that will not be thrown down." They asked
 him, saying: "Teacher, when will this be?" He said:
20 When you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies,
 then know that her desolation has come near.

- 21 Those within should go out
and those in the fields should not go in.
- 22 For days of vindication are these
to fulfill all that is written.
- 23 Great distress will be on the land
and wrath on this people.
- 24 They will fall by the mouth of the sword
and be led captive into all nations.
And Jerusalem will be trampled by the nations
until the times of the nations are fulfilled.
- 10 Then he said to them:
Nation will rise up against nation
and kingdom against kingdom;
- 11 there will be great earthquakes
and famines and pestilences.
There will be terrors from heaven
- 25 and signs in sun and moon and stars,
and on the earth distress and perplexity of the nations
and roaring of the sea and the waves;
- 26 and men fainting from fear
and foreboding of what is coming on the world.
- 28 When these things begin to take place,
look up and raise your heads,
for drawing near is your redemption.
- 37 And he was during the days on the temple mount teaching, but
during the nights he went out and spent the night on the mountain
- 38 called Of the Olives. And all the people were coming early to him
on the temple mount to hear him.

For our present purposes, it has usually been enough just to eliminate obvious Markan additions in order to arrive at a rough version of Proto-Luke, but here again more has been necessary. There are a number of stylistic rough places in the account of the entry which indicate the later intrusion of a phrase into an already existing text. The clearest is to be found in Lk 19:47f, where the position of "the leaders of the people" is very difficult to explain: *Καὶ ἦν διδάσκων τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ· οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν ἀπολέσαι καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι τοῦ λαοῦ, (καὶ) οὐχ εὗρισκον τὸ τί ποιήσωσιν.* A synoptic comparison shows that it is precisely the spaced words and only those words which agree verbatim with Mark. They have therefore been inserted as a block. The cry at Jesus' entry, "Blessed is he who comes, the king, in the name of the Lord" (19:38), has the apposition "the king" at an unfortunate place in the quotation, as a glance at the variant

readings which have tried to smooth out the sentence shows.¹ This reference to the king is clearly an interpolation, by means of which Luke wanted to interpret the entry messianically as do the other gospels. We are on less certain ground when we turn to the double genitive in 19:39, "some of the Pharisees of the crowd", but it is likely that the Pharisees have been added, for these verses do not deal with the Pharisees specifically but with the population of Jerusalem as a whole.

I have in another place given the evidence for a Proto-Lucan version of the apocalyptic discourse.² The most obvious example of a Markan insertion is Lk 21:21a = Mk 13:14b, for thereby the words αὐτῆς and αὐτήν in Vs 21b are made to refer to Judea, which makes no sense, instead of to the Jerusalem of Vs 20. There are a number of insertions from Mk 13 in this chapter, which have been copied almost verbatim, so Lk 21:8-9, 16-17, 21a, 23b, 26b-27, and in every case the removal of the insertion results in a text which makes more sense.³ Lk 21:7 agrees with the Markan formulation completely with the exception of two words, and it may be that from these two words we can reconstruct the Proto-Lucan text: διδάσκαλε, πότε οὖν ταῦτα γινήσεται; The weakest part of the reconstruction lies in the transposition of Vs 10f before Vs 25, but the new address in Vs 10 and the connection of Vs 11 and 25 seems to make it necessary.⁴ Lk 21:34-36 are clearly a Lucan addition based

¹ Thus DWit read "blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord," and Dit add "blessed is the king." A few texts read "blessed is the king in the name of the Lord," and the Byzantine text is "blessed is the coming king in the name of the Lord." The parallels in Mk 11:9; Mt 21:9; Jn 12:13 all quote correctly "blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord," but also add in a further saying a reference to the Messiah (Jn: the king of Israel; Mt, Mk: the Son of David). Luke clearly attempted to achieve the same end in a more economical way by simply inserting the words "the king".

² "Sondergut und Markusstoff in Luk. 21," *ThZ* 16 (1960), 161-172.

³ Lk 21:12-15, 18-19, being addressed to the disciples, do not belong in this context; cf. above, pp. 17-23.

⁴ Vs 11 in Dlatt syrsin ends "there will be terrors from heaven and great signs" while Vs 25 begins "and there will be signs in sun and moon and stars." When one also takes the parallelism into consideration, it seems clear that the signs have been doubled when the verses were separated. For the original connection of the two verses, cf. Spitta, "Die grosse eschatologische Rede Jesu," *TSK* 82 (1909), 348-401; Manson, *Mission and Message*, p. 623; Knox, *Sources*, I, p. 106. The remarks of William C. Robinson, Jr., *Der Weg des Herrn*, Hamburg, 1964, p. 48, against this connection are irrelevant in a discussion of Proto-Luke. He points out that in the Lucan understanding the signs in Vs 11 are of quite a different nature from those in Vs 25. This is

on the eschatological exhortation of the Hellenistic church, as the numerous parallels to 1 Thes 5:1ff show.¹ With these adjustments, when we remove the verses inserted from Mark, we have left a coherent, homogeneous discourse, with a single unifying conception and a definite parallelismus membrorum.

It is often claimed that the two predictions of the fall of Jerusalem Lk 19:43-44 and 21:20-24 are vaticinia ex eventu. Lying behind this are first, the unexamined and unjustifiable assumption that no prophecy can ever really foresee future events, and second, the acknowledged fact that Luke was probably written after A.D. 70. As an example of the tenacity of the first, we can quote the remarkable self-contradictory statement of Bultmann² on Lk 19:42-44, "eine christliche Bildung ex eventu, die vielleicht ziemlich alt ist." If the first assumption is questionable, the second is irrelevant. What is at issue is not whether Luke could have changed his sources in the light of events, but whether in fact he has done so. This can be determined only by an unprejudiced examination of the passages in question. They have been carefully analysed by the Septuagint scholar C. H. Dodd,³ who has come to the conclusion that while these texts may have been influenced by the language of the LXX in reference to the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C., there is no allusion to the events of A.D. 70. It is especially significant that none of the distinctive features of this terrible war are to be found in Luke: the factional fighting, the fire, the pestilence, and especially the cannibalism.⁴ An important contrast to Luke, showing what most impressed the survivors of the catastrophe of A.D. 70, is provided by syrBar 6-7. We hope to show not only that the Lucan predictions were not formulated after the fact, but that they have an understandable and consistent Sitz im Leben in the Proto-Lucan theology we have been examining.

We have already discussed the Lucan version of the entry into Jerusalem, and it remains only to analyse the rather detailed prediction of a coming military destruction. The multitude of the

of course true, or Luke would not have made the change, but it is no argument with respect to Proto-Luke.

¹ See above, pp. 56-58.

² *Syn. Trad.*, p. 130.

³ "The Fall of Jerusalem and the 'Abomination of Desolation'," *Journ. of Roman Studies* 37 (1947), 47-54.

⁴ Cf. Josephus, B. J. VI, 201ff. This is a strong argument for dating at least Bar 2:3 later than A.D. 70.

disciples welcome Jesus as him who has come to bring peace, but Jerusalem is castigated as the city which did not recognize the time of her visitation and the things of peace. The whole pericope is based on this contrast. It therefore seems probable that we are meant to understand the proverb of 19:40 in the same direction: "if they (the disciples) are silent, the stones will cry out." This way of speaking was known since Hab 2:11, but here in connection with the stones which will be razed to the ground in Vs 44 it seems to be meant more specifically. If the disciples do not speak, if they do not proclaim Jesus as the redeemer of Israel and the bringer of peace, then the eloquent message of the tumbled stones of a destroyed city will cry out to the survivors that Jerusalem should have repented.¹ When we note the conditional statement and think of the activity of the church which transmitted this saying, we might even paraphrase: if you do not heed the message of the church, Jerusalem will be destroyed. What follows is to be understood not as a prediction but as a conditional threat.

The whole scene of Jesus weeping over Jerusalem could have come straight from the pages of Jeremiah. Indeed it would not be difficult to put together a catena of passages to illustrate this. "My grief is beyond healing, my heart is sick within me. . . . O that my head were waters and my eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughters of my people. . . . They have healed the wound of my people lightly, saying, 'peace, peace,' when there is no peace. . . . For thus says the Lord of hosts, 'Hew down her trees, cast up a siege mound against Jerusalem. This is the city which must be punished. . . . Therefore they shall fall among those who fall; at the time that I visit them they shall be overthrown. . . . Be warned, O Jerusalem, lest I be alienated from you; lest I make you a desolation, an uninhabited land.' " ² Also the Lucan passage is meant as a warning, for in spite of everything, it is still not too

¹ Manson, *Mission and Message*, p. 611, thinks of the signs in the temple, B. J. VI, 288-300, in which "the very building seemed to be sensitive in some way to the coming disasters and to give warning of them." But in context it does not seem that the crying of the stones will be a warning beforehand but rather a threat which will come to pass if the warning of the disciples is not heeded. When we consider how often these predictions are couched in terms of the stones of the collapsing houses, it is remotely possible that the words in Lk 11:17, "every kingdom divided against itself is laid waste and house falls on house," once referred to the fall of Jerusalem.

² Jer 8:18, 23; 8:11 = 6:14; 6:6, 15, 8.

late to recognize that the coming of Jesus was the visitation of God to redeem Jerusalem (cf. 1:68; 2:38).

The threat begins as do two other predictions of the fall of Jerusalem (21:6; 23:29) with the standard phrase "days are coming. . ." The enemies of Jerusalem will set up a siege mound around the city, as did Nebuchadnezzar.¹ They will raze the city to the ground,² while, as we learn in a Semitic circumstantial clause, the inhabitants are still inside. The parallel verse says the same thing in an especially memorable way: "they will not leave stone on stone in you." This is not prediction, it is prophecy, a prophetic warning couched in Old Testament language, which the speaker hopes will not have to come to pass.

We have seen how the Proto-Lucan passion story emphasizes Jesus' popularity with the people of Jerusalem, he being opposed only by the Sadducees and οἱ πρῶτοι τοῦ λαοῦ (19:47). It is emphasized that Jesus taught daily on the temple mount, because the early Jerusalem church taught daily on the temple mount, and it is also said that the church was popular with the people. There are two such notices, Lk 19:47f and 21:37f, and they appear at the beginning and at the end of the "eschatological discourse." The address of this discourse to the people of Jerusalem could not be made plainer. Accordingly we should call it "the warning to Jerusalem."

It is the remark of one of the people, not the disciples, which provokes Jesus' renewed threat, "that which you see,³ days are coming, and they will not leave stone on stone that will not be thrown down." Again it is the people of Jerusalem who ask him, "Teacher, when will this be?" It is after all the inhabitants of Jerusalem who are most concerned with the threatened destruction of their city, not a small band of Christians living there, to say nothing of Hellenistic Christians in other parts of the empire. That is why the theme of the destruction of Jerusalem, which must have

¹ 2 Kg 25:1f; Jer 52:4f; Ezek 4:1-3; 21:22; 26:8f; cf. Is 29:3; 37:33. Although Vespasian also set up a χάραξ at first (B.J. V, 262ff), militarily decisive was the wall (τείχος) Titus later built around the city (B.J. V, 491ff).

² Although ἐδαφίζω is used in the LXX to translate שטח, "to dash (children) to the ground", the verb here applied to a city is used in the older sense of "to make level with the ground", as in LXX Is 3:26. Note that the simplex ἔδαφος, ground, is found in the Lucan writings, Acts 22:7.

³ Note the casus pendens.

been an important part of the preaching of the early church and probably of Jesus himself, has not survived in the New Testament except for Proto-Luke. Alongside the promises of the gospel in the preaching to Israel went the threat of catastrophe to come if the nation did not heed the promise. Again it must be underlined that it is a matter of a prophetic threat, not of a prediction, for over everything stands the conditional warning: "unless you repent, you will all likewise perish" (13:5).

Jesus' answer to the question "when" is given in a truly ironic manner: "when you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies." This is of course no sign which would help in anticipating the event, but part of the event itself. As in 19:43f the horrors of the coming destruction are hinted at in a prophetic manner reminiscent of the Old Testament. Jerusalem shall become a desolation.¹ As at the time of the Maccabees people are urged to flee the cities in haste. For these are days of vindication,² in which all that is written of judgment in the Old Testament will be fulfilled. Great distress will be on the land (of Judea, as the parallel shows) and wrath on this people, for this is the day of the Lord, and "a day of wrath is that day, a day of distress and anguish, a day of ruin and devastation" (Zeph 1:15). People will fall by the sword³ and be dispersed as captives among all nations,⁴ and Jerusalem will be trodden down by the nations.⁵ It is just barely possible that Luke has understood the *καίροισι ἐθνῶν* as the time allotted for the progress of Gentile Christianity, a similar thought to that of Rm 11:25f. But if this is only a conjecture, it is fairly certain that it was not the meaning of Proto-Luke, for there is not the slightest indication in the text that this will be a time of salvation for the Gentiles. What is meant is rather a time of Gentile oppression in retribution for the sins of Jerusalem.⁶ No exact parallel for these words can be found in the

¹ חרבה; cf. Jer 27:17; Ezek 5:14; Is 51:3; 52:9; Dn 9:2; etc. The cities of Judah are described as desolate (e.g. Jer 25:18; 44:2, 6; Ezek 36:10; Is 44:26; 58:12) or the whole land (Is 1:7; Jer 7:34; 25:11; 44:22; Ezek 33:24, 27; Is 64:10).

² Cf. Hos 9:7; Jer 26:10, 21; 27:27, 31.

³ Cf. e.g. Jer 20:4f; 21:7.

⁴ Cf. e.g. Am 5:5; Dt 28:64.

⁵ Cf. Mic 7:10; Is 5:3; 7:25; 10:6; 16:4; Lam 2:8 LXX; 1 Mac 3:45; 4:60; Ps Sol 17:22; Josephus, B. J. II, 262; IV, 171; VI, 126f; and especially Dn 8:13; Is 63:18; Zech 12:3 LXX.

⁶ This has been a standard locus of the prophetic message ever since Amos; cf. Am 3:11; 5:5, 27; 6:14; 7:11, 17; 9:1, 4.

LXX, and it is not even certain whether they are meant as a threat or a promise. One could think of Dn 7:25; 9:26f, the $3\frac{1}{2}$ years during which Jerusalem is trodden down (Dn 8:130!) before the final salvation comes. This would then be a promise: only $3\frac{1}{2}$ years, and then you will no longer be oppressed by the Gentiles (cf. Vs 28). But if this were meant, the reference would have to be clearer, and it is more likely that the saying is meant as a threat with no thought at all being given to the length of the oppression.

This section of Proto-Luke had been opened by the question of the people in the temple: when will the destruction be? This question has now been answered, even if not in a temporal sense, but the discourse does not end here. Just as in the prophets of the Old Testament a promise of eventual salvation often follows a threat of judgment, so here too we have a promise.¹ As in the prophets, the Gentiles are God's organ of punishment for his people, but they become guilty of arrogance (Is 10:5-19, etc.) and are finally in their turn judged. "Nation will rise against nation," a well-known saying in the early church which expresses exactly what is meant here about the disobedience and disorder of the heathen instruments of vengeance. There will be earthquakes and famines and pestilences, and there will be signs in the heavenly bodies. It is to be noted that this is not the end of the world—the stars do not fall as in Mark—but the heavenly portents which had always been thought to go with God's judgments in history. Ever since Gunkel,² it has been customary to interpret the sea and the waves as the returning chaos (cf. Ps 46:3; 93:3; etc.), but the image had also long been used in Israel to mean the Gentile world. Thus it is found in parallelism with the nations in Is 17:12, "Ah, the thunder of many peoples, they thunder like the thundering of the sea! Ah, the roar of nations, they roar like the roaring of mighty waters!" or in Ps 144:7, "rescue me and deliver me from the many waters, from the hand of aliens" (cf. Ps 98:7f; 144:1-3; Ezek 26:19; Rev 17:15).³ The text of Vs 25b is not in order, and I suggest reading with D al to make the parallelism clear: "and on the earth distress and

¹ And just as in the prophets, the connection of the promise with the threat is secondary, the words probably having been spoken on different occasions and having only a literary connection, as the new beginning shows.

² *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, Göttingen, 1895, pp. 89ff.

³ On this symbolism cf. H. G. May, "Some Cosmic Connotations of *Majim Rabbim*, Many Waters," *JBL* 74 (1955), 9-21; and E. Hilgert, *The Ship and Related Symbols in the New Testament*, Assen, 1962, p. 47.

perplexity (καὶ ἀπορία) of the nations / and roaring (ἡχούσης) of the sea and the waves.”¹ “When these things,” i.e. the disorder among the nations and the signs in the heavenly bodies, “begin to take place,” then “your” redemption is drawing near. Who is being addressed here? The interpretation of the whole section depends on this point. We have seen that in Vs 7 the hearers of the discourse are Jerusalemites in the temple, and we have surmised therefore that those addressed in Vs 20 are also Jews. The words τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ in Vs 23 seem decisively to confirm this supposition. Unless we have good reason for assuming that the character of the discourse has changed, this must also be the case in Vs 28. Israel is told that after the destruction of temple and city, after the oppression by the Gentiles, the day of the Lord will mean for them redemption. We must be careful not to say more than this, for the text is purposefully reticent and mysterious.

There is no parallel to this address in any part of the Christian tradition, but that is because, if our hypothesis is correct, only Proto-Luke has preserved some of the preaching of the church directly to Israel. Especially unique is the joining of the promise of eventual salvation to the prophetic warning to Israel of the destruction of Jerusalem. We do however find very close parallels in contemporary Jewish writing, of which the Syriac Baruch may be taken as an example. In 1:4 we hear that disaster will come over Jerusalem to chastise its inhabitants, who will be dispersed among the Gentiles. But Jerusalem will be “trampled down” (5:1) for but a time (4:1), and then will come her restoration (6:9). The inhabitants of the earth are warned not to be arrogant about Jerusalem’s fall (12:3), for judgment will also come to them: first to Israel and then to the Gentiles (13:5ff). This judgment on the world will come soon, for God has shortened the time (20:1f). Then terror will fall upon the Gentiles (25:3), and the twelve times of tribulation will come on the world (27), including “the beginning of the sufferings” (27:2), earthquakes (27:7), famines (27:6), and signs in the heavens (27:9). Then will appear the Messiah (29), and after the Messianic times his ascension and the resurrection of the dead

¹ A. Merx, *Die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas*, Berlin, 1905, pp. 404f., reconstructs the text from syrsin: καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς συνοχή καὶ ἀπορία ἐθνῶν καὶ ἡχος θαλάσσης καὶ σάλος. Also Black, *Aramaic Approach*, p. 196, prefers the nominative ἀπορία to establish the parallelism, but he reads the second member with vet it “prae confusione sonitus maris.”

(30). Jerusalem will be once more destroyed in the last great battle (31), but then restored in glory for all eternity (32). Typical for the whole situation of the book is 82:2, "Yet you should know that our Creator will surely take vengeance on all our enemies, after that which they have done to us; and that this end which the Highest will bring is very near, as is his Grace which will appear, and that the end of his judgment is not far." The contrasts to Proto-Luke are of course just as significant as the similarities—Baruch makes a whole program out of what is only suggested Lk 21:28—but we can at least see a similar train of thought as that which led to the coupling of Lk 21:20-24 and 25-28.

In this chapter especially we see how it would be a mistake to try to separate the historical from the supernatural in the thought of the early church.¹ There is no fixed apocalyptic program, but only the injunction to repent in the present crisis, for the end when it comes will be sudden. This crisis of fulfillment is brought together in a number of passages with the political crisis, in such a fashion that the two often cannot be distinguished. That is because the fall of Jerusalem in Proto-Luke is spoken of not as a future historical event but as a warning, a threat which the church still hopes will not happen. But even if the worst does happen, still the promises of God to Israel will not fail of fulfillment.

There is one final warning of the fall of Jerusalem in Lk 23:27-31. As the women of the city accompanied Jesus on the way to the cross with lamentation, Jesus said to them, "Daughters of Jerusalem, do not weep for me, but weep for yourselves and for your children² for behold, days are coming³ in which they will say: 'blessed are the barren and the wombs which have not given birth and the breasts which have not given suck.' Then they will begin to say to the mountains, 'fall on us' and to the hills, 'cover us'. For if they do this with green wood, what will happen with the dry?" Again we find a saying which reminds us of the Old Testament, and Hos 10:8 is actually cited. Vs 28-30 are a premonition of disaster to come without being specific.⁴ The last saying however seems to refer directly to

¹ As does Conzelmann; cf. above, p. 50.

² Cf. 2 Sm 1:24; Is 3:16; Zech 9:9; Cant 1:5.

³ Cf. Lk 19:43; 21:6.

⁴ W. Käser, "Exegetische und theologische Erwägungen zur Seligpreisung der Kinderlosen Lc 23:29b," *ZNW* 54 (1963), 240-254, supposes that Is 54:1-10 promising blessedness to the barren underlies this text, because in 54:10 mountains and hills are mentioned. They have however a completely

the political situation in Israel. The expression itself is proverbial; cf. Seder Elijjahu Rabba 14 (65), "when fire catches the green, what shall the dry do?"¹ In context the only convincing explanation of the meaning of the proverb is that given by Cullmann:² if the Romans crucify me, who am not really a Zealot, what will they do to Jerusalem when your spirit of rebellion matures? This too is not a prediction but a warning, using Jesus himself as an example: learn from his fate before it is too late!

At the end of our investigation we ought to be able to come to certain conclusions. Predictions of the fall of Jerusalem were transmitted as a threat in the preaching of the church to Israel. In itself this did not concern the Hellenistic church, and for this reason there is little reference to the political situation of Jerusalem in the epistles and most of the gospels. Only Luke seems to preserve directly the tradition of the Palestinian church, and we have assumed that this tradition came to him in the form of a document. Proto-Luke shows a great concern for Jerusalem and Israel, positively in the preaching of Jesus as redeemer of Israel and negatively in the threat of the destruction of Jerusalem. In this setting all the "predictions", which are really threats, fit so well that we have undoubtedly found their real Sitz im Leben. The form of the saying Mk 13:2 is now seen to be clearly secondary when it 1. is addressed to the disciples and 2. concerns the destruction of the temple. In the present chapter we have been concerned only with Proto-Luke, and we have not yet considered directly the teaching of Jesus and the understanding of later writings. This will be the task of the final and concluding chapter. However we hope to have already demonstrated the importance to the Palestinian church of the saying of Jesus, "they will not leave stone on stone that will not be thrown down."

6. APPENDIX: JERUSALEM AND THE TEMPLE IN THE LUCAN WRITINGS

The great importance of Jerusalem in the Lucan writings has often been recognized.³ Along with this we must consider the temple,

different sense than in the explicit Hosea quotation. Käser has not succeeded in finding in this passage a promise of a new event in Heilsgeschichte, against the plain meaning which speaks only of Unheil.

¹ Cited along with other expressions by Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, II, p. 263.

² *Der Staat im Neuen Testament*, Tübingen, 1956, pp. 33f.

³ "Weit stärker als bei den anderen Synoptikern wird im Lukasevangelium

for the two are related. Luke distinguishes precisely between the temple itself (ναός) and the temple mount (ἱερόν),¹ and it is the latter which interests him. Compared to the other gospels the disinterest of Luke in the temple cult is astounding. He knows perfectly well about the ναός and its functions (1:9, 21f),² but the ἱερόν is seen not in connection with any cultic activity but as the place of teaching and proclamation to Israel. The temple mount is the place where Simeon, a man waiting for the consolation of Israel, welcomed Jesus as the Messiah of the Lord, and where Anna remained constantly, "worshipping with fasting and prayer" and waiting for the redemption of Jerusalem. Jesus the Messiah has come to bring salvation to Jerusalem, the center of the world, so that this salvation would mean not only glory for God's people Israel but also a light for revelation to the Gentiles (2:25-38). The boy Jesus is found on the temple mount "sitting in the midst of the teachers" (2:46). The temple mount is the scene of the third temptation, on the pinnacle far from the place of sacrifice (4:9). The temple mount is the place of prayer not of sacrifice (18:10), and perhaps most important, it is the place where Jesus taught the inhabitants of Jerusalem, who heard him gladly (19:47; 21:5, 37f). In the book of Acts the situation is the same. When the disciples are told to stay in Jerusalem, this means concretely the temple mount (cf. the summary Lk 24:53). The speeches to Jerusalem all take place on the temple mount (Acts 2:6; 3:11; 4:1, 7; 5:25; 6:14). If the summary Acts 2:46 merely says that the disciples went daily to the temple mount, the summary of 5:42 tells what they did there: "and every day on the temple mount and at home they did not cease teaching Jesus as the Christ." The angel who appears to Peter in prison tells him explicitly, "go and stand on the temple mount and speak to the people all the words of this life" (5:20). Significant is the parallelism of 5:25, "the men whom you put in prison are standing in the

die Bedeutung Jerusalems hervorgehoben," Lohse *TWNT* VII, 330, 8f. Cf. A. Hastings, *Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem; A Study of the Teaching of Saint Luke*, Baltimore, 1958, pp. 98-124, 176-186; Conzelmann, *Mitte der Zeit*, pp. 66-86, esp. 124-127; G. Braumann, "Lukanische Interpretation"; B. Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript*, Uppsala, 1961, pp. 214-220; H. Flender, *Heil und Geschichte*, pp. 100ff.; and K. Baltzer, "The Meaning of the Temple in the Lucan Writings," *HTR* 58 (1965), 263-277.

¹ Cf. Michel, *TWNT* IV, 890.

² Note that even here, in the only passages where ναός is used in Proto-Luke of the Jerusalem temple, what actually happens is a *vision* granted to Zechariah.

temple and teaching the people" and 5:28, "you have filled Jerusalem with your teaching." We even learn the concrete place where the teaching occurred, in the Portico of Solomon (3:11; 5:12; cf. Jn 10:23). The temple mount is seen in Luke-Acts in a very positive but distinctively non-cultic sense. "The prophecies and expectations concerning the holy city and its 'centre', the Temple, must be fulfilled. It is in Jerusalem that the act of atonement must take place, and it is from Jerusalem that the logos of God must proceed in the age of salvation."¹

This recognition of the non-cultic importance of Jerusalem and the temple leaves the interesting study of Baltzer rather up in the air as far as Luke is concerned. He says concerning the problem of the temple: "Luke solved the problem by means of his Christology. For him, Christ is the presence of God, because Christ, *kābôd*/δόξα, and spirit are related."² While this would be true for John, in Luke there is no evidence that there ever was a temple problem to be solved in the first place. A. Schlatter comes much closer to characterizing the Lucan conception: "Nicht um des Kultus willen, den der Jude im Tempel übt, wird er verehrt, sondern weil er die Verbundenheit Gottes mit dem Volke sichtbar macht. Um des Tempels willen ist Jerusalem die heilige Stadt und die palästinische Judenschaft der wichtigste Teil des auserwählten Volkes. Um ihr Schicksal ringt der Christus dieses Evangeliums und durch ihren Untergang leidet er. Er möchte den unfruchtbaren Feigenbaum vor der Vernichtung retten; er kann es aber nicht, weil er unfruchtbar bleibt."³

H. Conzelmann does not take sufficiently into account this positive aspect of Jerusalem and the temple in Luke. In addition he constantly yields to the temptation of ascribing to Luke what is really the conception of his sources, and he does not take seriously form-critical insights concerning the various functions of the material. It is thus very misleading when he says, "Reise, Passion, Schuld der Juden und (von da zu verstehen!) Geschick der Stadt bilden einen festen Komplex."⁴ Only the insertion of Lk 13:31-33

¹ Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript*, p. 220. The idea of Jesus' death being an act of atonement is questionable for Luke and definitely for Proto-Luke.

² "Meaning of the Temple," p. 277.

³ *Lukas*, pp. 151-152.

⁴ *Mitte der Zeit*, p. 125.

before 13:34 could lead to such a conclusion, but as we have seen ¹ the insertion was made for a different reason, and the contiguity of these two passages can hardly be made a pillar of Lucan theology isolated from the rest of the gospel. Jesus' journey to Jerusalem is not just in order to die but in order to accomplish his *ἔξοδος* (9:31), his *ἀνάληψις* (9:51), which includes also the positive understanding we find in Acts. The "guilt of the Jews" is definitely not associated with Jesus' death but with their refusal to heed the preaching of the church, and predictions of the destruction of Jerusalem are found in this context only. If Conzelmann is misleading, others have learned from him to make statements which are simply false; e.g. Braumann,² "der Untergang der Stadt ist bei Lukas bedingt durch die Schuld der Juden, die darin ihre Ursache hat, dass sie die Urheber der Passion Jesu sind," or even more extreme Flender,³ "erst mit der Zerstörung Jerusalems gewinnt die Kreuzigung Jesu geschichtliche Relevanz." Finally, Conzelmann himself says,⁴ "die Juden zerstören ihre Erwählung, indem sie Jesus töten." The evidence of this whole chapter is meant to show how completely wrong this statement is. The double understanding of Luke is ably presented by Jervell,⁵ and we hope to have shown how this double understanding is based on the double attitude of Proto-Luke engaged in the mission to Israel. The predictions of the fall of Jerusalem not only in Proto-Luke but also in Luke have quite a different function from that assigned to them by Conzelmann.

Another oft quoted statement by Conzelmann ⁶ raises some very interesting questions: "Lukas entwickelt seine Eschatologie in ausdrücklicher Auseinandersetzung mit der Grösse Jerusalem." Although this probably does not apply to Lk 19:11, it is to an extent true of the discourse Lk 21 after it has been modified by the Markan additions. By these additions Luke seems to be interpreting the fall of Jerusalem as a type of the final judgment at the end, which he now describes explicitly in 21:25ff. What in Proto-Luke still was an alternative, either salvation to Israel or destruction of Jerusalem, becomes in Luke a temporal succession: first salvation to part of Israel, then the fulfillment of the threat, then the fulfillment of the

¹ See above, p. 343.

² "Lukanische Interpretation," p. 122.

³ *Heil und Geschichte*, p. 22.

⁴ *Mitte der Zeit*, p. 125.

⁵ "Das gespaltene Israel".

⁶ *Mitte der Zeit*, p. 67.

salvation for the Gentiles, and finally the end. Luke has made this modification because of the logic of the events of the failure of the mission of the Palestinean church and the historic fall of the city, and he has done so by using Mark. Thus while Conzelmann's statement may be true for Luke, it applies even more to Mark. The investigation of the significance of the coupling of eschatology and the fall of Jerusalem will be part of our concluding chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE FALL OF JERUSALEM AND ESCHATOLOGY

We have now answered the question of the significance of the fall of Jerusalem in the synoptic gospels, by outlining the growth of Mark 13, by giving a detailed exposition of the background of Mark 14:58, and by seeing the Lucan predictions in their original setting. However, we still are not able to answer all the questions with which we began. Even if we have shown that the temple as such was not of interest to Jesus or the early church, but that they were concerned rather with Jerusalem and its inhabitants, we are still left with the question of why the fall of the city should be associated with the end of the age. By way of conclusion, the present chapter will try to suggest an answer to this question of why, without the kind of detailed study which has gone before. It is also hoped that a summary statement of what has been developed piecemeal in the earlier chapters will be helpful at this point. We have constantly been confronted with two great distinct problems in New Testament interpretation, which are generally considered separately and not in conjunction: eschatology and the relation of the church to Israel. It is only by considering these problems in the areas where they overlap that we shall be able even to suggest an answer to the relationship between the fall of Jerusalem and eschatology.

I. JESUS AND THE FUTURE

A. *The Son of Man*

It is significant that discussion of this title has recently become very central in research in the synoptic gospels. That we should discuss it here lies not only in the fact that it shows in general the attitude of Jesus and the early church to the future but also because of its relationship to the specific topics of this study. Thus we can perhaps account for some of the background of Mk 13:26 and hopefully demonstrate that the concept of Son of Man is parallel to the new temple which Jesus builds. As this will involve an unusual interpretation of the concept, it will not be possible to give a

thorough argumentation here. A brief glance at current opinion will be helpful.

The best presentation of what can be called the classical view of the Son of Man sayings in the gospels is that given by O. Cullmann.¹ He maintains that the Son of Man is a recognized Jewish apocalyptic figure derived from both Daniel and Enoch. The sayings of Jesus concerning the Son of Man are on the whole genuine sayings, and Jesus refers to himself with the term, expressing his consciousness of fulfilling the mission of the heavenly man. Not only do the future sayings refer to Jesus' future role, but also those concerning the present and suffering refer to the earthly Jesus, because he has reinterpreted the Son of Man by combining this figure with that of the Suffering Servant. This interpretation has the decisive advantage of accounting for the fact that the expression appears in the New Testament only in sayings of Jesus (c. 37 times in the synoptics plus parallels; c. 13 times in John), with the exception of Acts 7:56 and some quotations. By every formal criterion the expression must represent genuine sayings of Jesus,² and difficulties arise only because the contents seem to refer to two irreconcilable figures: the earthly Jesus and the apocalyptic heavenly man. The great weakness of the classical view lies in the attempt to bridge this difference, for there is little evidence that Jesus or the early church in fact did combine the figure of the Son of Man with that of the Suffering Servant.

Over against the questionable reconstruction involved in the classical view, Bultmann³ seems to offer a distinct advantage in his distinction of three classes of Son of Man sayings, which represent three separate traditions: a) Those sayings referring to the earthly Jesus represent either a misunderstanding of the Aramaic **בר נשא**, which should have been translated **ἐγώ**,⁴ or they are the

¹ O. Cullmann, *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments*, Tübingen, 1957, pp. 138-198; in the gospels pp. 154-167.

² Cf. also E. Stauffer, "Messias oder Menschensohn," *NT* 1 (1956), 81-102; *Jesus, Gestalt und Geschichte*, Bern, 1957, pp. 122ff.

³ R. Bultmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, Tübingen, 1954², pp. 29-31; cf. R. H. Fuller, *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus*, London, 1954, pp. 95-108.

⁴ This philological argument is of course false, for G. Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, Leipzig, 1930², pp. 204f, pointed out long ago that while "this man" can be a paraphrasis for "I", the phrase is **ההוא גברא** and not **בר נשא**; cf. recently the emphatic statements of P. Vielhauer, "Jesus und der Menschen-

addition by the church of a title to sayings in which Jesus originally said only "I".¹ b) Those sayings referring to the death of Jesus are not found in Q and are all vaticinia ex eventu. And finally, c) those sayings referring to a heavenly figure who on the last day will come on the clouds of heaven to judge the earth are genuine sayings of Jesus, but he is not speaking of himself. While it can be readily admitted that the Markan predictions of the passion and resurrection represent a summary of Mk 14-16 and serve more of a literary purpose than accurately reflect genuine sayings of Jesus, the distinction between those sayings in groups "a" and "b" is not a good one and cannot be carried out in practice.² All the more important, however, is the discovery that sayings in group "c" have nothing in common with those in groups "a" and "b" except the title and that no saying combines parousia with death and resurrection.

Perhaps the best work on the Son of Man to date continues in this tradition. H. E. Tödt³ is able to show how the genuine Son of Man sayings fit in with the teaching of Jesus on the kingdom of God and particularly with the theology of Q. The function of these sayings is to emphasize the authority of the proclamation of the earthly Jesus, and to hold out a promise to those who confess their allegiance to Jesus along with a threat to those who do not. It is then understandable that the key saying for Tödt's presentation is Lk 12:8f, "I tell you, everyone who confesses me before men, the Son of Man will confess him before the angels of God; but whoever denies me before men will be denied before the angels of God." While it is true that this saying seems to distinguish between Jesus and the Son of Man, it is hard to see why Tödt still wants to speak of the latter as an apocalyptic heavenly figure. If the genuine Son of Man sayings show that the "Gemeinschaft, die Jesus auf Erden gibt, . . . vergeht nicht mit diesem Geschlecht, sondern wird vom

sohn. Zur Diskussion mit Heinz Eduard Tödt und Eduard Schweizer," *ZThK* 60 (1963), 133-177, pp. 157-159.

¹ This is a possibility; cf. Mt 16:13 in relation to Mk 8:27. It might be difficult however to give a reason for the substitution in every case.

² For example Lk 9:58, "the Son of Man has nowhere to lay his head," could be classified under either the "present" or "suffering" usage, as pointed out by Fuller, *Mission*, pp. 104f.

³ H. E. Tödt, *Der Menschensohn in der synoptischen Überlieferung*, Gütersloh, 1959. A. J. B. Higgins, *Jesus and the Son of Man*, London, 1964, is similar but concentrates on the teaching of Jesus more than the Christology of Q. He also discusses the Johannine sayings but only to dismiss them.

Menschensohn bestätigt und vor Gott verbürgt werden,"¹ then it seems that there will be two eschatological figures at the end: Jesus, whose fellowship does not pass away, and the Son of Man, who guarantees it.² *Entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem*. Contrary to Tödt's intention, his careful analysis really shows the untenability of the idea of an apocalyptic Son of Man and the inauthenticity of the sayings in group "c".

P. Vielhauer³ is then only being consistent when he goes on to deny the authenticity of all the Son of Man sayings. He points out that there is no saying in the synoptic gospels which combines both the Son of Man and the kingdom of God, and since it is inconceivable that two such central concepts should never be seen in relationship to one another, therefore they must come from two separate sources. Since it is impossible to deny the concept of kingdom of God in Jesus' teaching, therefore none of the Son of Man sayings are genuine. Part of the background for this conclusion is no less important for being essentially psychological. It simply does not fit in with our impression of Jesus to suppose that he would apply any title to himself.⁴ Although it is only an impression, we have to agree with Bultmann⁵ when he says: "dass Jesus angenommen habe, er werde dereinst zum 'Menschensohn' werden, erscheint mir als zu phantastisch." If not equally fantastic, it is also very uncharacteristic for Jesus to be speaking of someone else in speaking of a future coming of a Son of Man. If Bultmann argued for the inauthenticity of the sayings in groups "a" and "b", it is equally clear that the sayings of group "c" are also not genuine sayings of Jesus.

¹ Tödt, *Menschensohn*, pp. 239f.

² "Wer die Echtheit dieser Worte annimmt, sie aber meint so erklären zu sollen, dass Jesus mit diesem kommenden Menschensohn nicht sich selber, sondern einen anderen bezeichne, stellt mehr Probleme als er löst," Cullmann, *Christologie*, p. 159.

³ Ph. Vielhauer, "Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu," *Festschrift für Günther Dehn*, Neukirchen, 1957, pp. 51-79 = *Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament*, München, 1965, pp. 55-91. He has been followed by H. Conzelmann, "Gegenwart und Zukunft in der synoptischen Tradition," *ZThK* 54 (1957), 277-296, and H. M. Teeple, "The Origin of the Son of Man Christology," *JBL* 84 (1965), 213-250; cf. also E. Käsemann, "Das Problem des historischen Jesus," *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*, I Göttingen, 1960², pp. 187-214, p. 211.

⁴ This point is strongly emphasized by e.g. J. Knox, *The Death of Christ*, London, 1959, pp. 52-77.

⁵ *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, Göttingen, 1958⁴, p. 145.

When an argument is conclusive but reaches an impossible conclusion, then something is wrong with the premises. Since on formal grounds it goes against all principles of criticism to jettison all the Son of Man sayings, then something must be wrong with the content we give the concept. In this case it is the unconscious influence of R. Otto ¹ which has misled a whole generation of scholars. Tödt spoils his otherwise very perceptive study by beginning with an unexamined and really untenable presupposition, for the very first sentence of his exposition is: "Der intensive Zusammenhang der synoptischen mit der spätjüdisch-apokalyptischen Menschensohnavorstellung kann heute nicht mehr ernstlich bestritten werden." ² If this presupposition should prove to be untenable, then the whole question is reopened, and the Son of Man sayings are seen in quite a different light. Some of the earlier problems will reappear in a new guise, and some solution will have to be found for them. There are two which are most important: 1) the problem of uniting in one conception sayings referring to the earthly Jesus and those referring to an apocalyptic figure at the parousia, and 2) the fact that Son of Man and kingdom of God do not seem to be related to one another in the gospel tradition.

There is no such thing as a pre-Christian apocalyptic figure called Son of Man. It has been possible to claim that there was only by reading Daniel and the New Testament in the light of the Babylonian-Iranian myth of the primitive man on the one hand ³ and of certain post-Christian writings on the other hand. This is illegitimate. Not only is 4 Esra definitely post-Christian, but there is no figure of a Son of Man which could be presupposed as an earlier conception. 4 Es 13 speaks of the *figure* of the Messiah, describing him at several points with *language* derived from Dan 7, which is quite a different thing. The situation with respect to the Similitudes of Enoch is more complex, but the fact that fragments of every

¹ R. Otto, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*, London, 1943².

² Tödt, *Menschensohn*, p. 19.

³ The connection with the Babylonian Urmensch is emphasized by C. H. Kraeling, *Anthropos and the Son of Man*, New York, 1927, and S. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, Oxford, 1956, pp. 420-437, while a specifically Iranian influence is posited by Bousset-Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*, Tübingen, 1926³, pp. 352ff, and W. Staerk, *Soter II, Die Erlöserverwartung in den östlichen Religionen*, Gütersloh, 1938, pp. 7-144. It is not to be denied that this myth influenced late Jewish Adam speculation, but it does not seem warranted to interpret the Son of Man in Dn 7 as if it were only a version of this myth.

chapter of Ethiopian Enoch have been found at Qumran *except* for chapters 37-71 has led many scholars to the conclusion that these chapters (the Similitudes) are not pre-Christian.¹ It may be that also the Similitudes borrows only the language of Daniel in order to describe the primeval man (here Enoch not Adam). While this can be left to specialists to decide, it is clear that the burden of proof lies on him who would claim Enoch as a background for the elucidation of Daniel and the gospels. The situation in the Rabbinic literature is clearer, for while the language of Dn 7 can on occasion be used to describe the ascension of someone to the heavenly throne (e.g. Akiba, Hag 14a, cf. Midrash Ps 2:9), the only title derived from the passage is not Son of Man but cloud-man ('Anani or Bar-Naphli). It seems that Lietzmann² was right when he maintained years ago that the Aramaic bar-nasha could not serve as a Messianic title, although of course the language of Dn 7:13 could be applied to various figures. We feel justified then in eliminating completely the idea of a transcendental apocalyptic figure called Son of Man as a background for the New Testament conception. Although the language of Dn 7 is used, it remains an open question for investigation as to how this language is applied.

If we approach Daniel himself without the above presuppositions, reading the book in the light of its predecessors in Old Testament prophecy and not of its successors in the later apocalyptic literature, we find that we are dealing with the situation of charismatic exeg-

¹ Cf. J. T. Milik, "Le travail d'édition des manuscrits de Qumran," *Rev. Bibl.* 63 (1956), 47-67, p. 60; M. Black, "The Son of Man Problem in Recent Research and Debate," *Bull. Jn. Ryl. Lib.* 45 (1963), 305-318, p. 312. The most recent statement by C. H. Dodd appears in a review of W. D. Davies, *Invitation to the New Testament*, in the *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 21 (1966), 474-476: "In his interesting and well-documented discussion of the meaning of 'Son of Man', Dr. Davies mentions the fact that the 'Similitudes' of Enoch have so far failed to turn up among the now fairly numerous fragments of Enochic literature at Qumran (as they have also failed to turn up among the extensive Greek fragments found elsewhere), and he notes that therefore 'there is still some doubt whether the references in it to the Son of Man are pre-Christian or not' (p. 181). I should myself be disposed to put the case more strongly. As things stand at present, is there any evidence worth talking about that 'Son of Man' was a title for a quasi-messianic figure in pre-Christian Judaism? I should say not. (In Daniel, as I take it, the figure 'like a man' is no more a 'real' angelic being than the 'beasts' are real diabolical beings.)"

² H. Lietzmann, *Der Menschensohn. Ein Beitrag zur neutestamentlichen Theologie*, Leipzig, 1896. He argues that the phrase could not be used as a title in Aramaic; it would be better to say that it was not so used.

esis, whereby the Old Testament prophecies are actualized for a new situation. Insofar as apocalyptic develops from the post-exilic prophecies in the Zion tradition, none of which is to be found in Daniel, it is probable that the book is not to be considered apocalyptic at all. Von Rad has pointed us in quite a different direction by his insight that Daniel belongs in the wisdom tradition.¹ This is especially true of the success stories of Dn 1-6. In addition to the fact that these collected stories are all more or less relevant for the situation of the persecution of Israel under Antiochos Epiphanes, it is the *peshet* interpretation which unites the two halves of the book: on the one hand the interpretation of dreams, and on the other the interpretation of earlier prophecies by the same method.

If the author of Daniel only collected the stories in Chapters 1-6, his own writing is to be found in Chapters (7)8-12, where the external form is with one exception that of vision and interpretation. It is however this one exception, Chapter 9, which gives us the real form, that of a *peshet* interpretation of scripture. It is what R. Meyer in an excellent discussion of late prophecy calls an example "eines pneumatischen Erlebnisses auf Grund kontemplativer Schriftbetrachtung."² Yet even Chapter 9 is if you will clothed in the same form as the rest, for it is Gabriel who gives the interpretation in a vision. We can then all the more easily see how such a charismatic interpretation lies also behind the visions in Chapters 7 and 11. The visions may be genuine or not, but the charismatic gift Daniel claims for himself is not that of having visions but of interpreting scripture, and it is on this basis that he must be judged.

We read of the word of God in Is 40:8 that it stands forever (cf. 55:10f), and the following prophets took this seriously. Every word of the former prophets must be fulfilled. Deutero-Isaiah had announced in effect that the word of Jer 25:11f; 29:10 was about to be fulfilled by Cyrus. Jeremiah had said seventy years probably only because it was a terminus beyond the lifetime of his hearers, but when great expectations were attached to this word, a word which could not "return empty", and history did not live up to these expectations, a new interpretation had to be found. We see hints of this search for a new interpretation in Zech 1:6 and in 2 Chron 36:21 even a hint of Daniel's interpretation by Sabbath years.

¹ G. von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, II, München, 1960, pp. 319-321.

² *TWNT* VI, 820, 15f.

Daniel's interpretation may be charismatic, but it follows a tradition. In chapter 9 he announces not a prediction of the future but that the old prophecy of Jeremiah is about to be fulfilled in a form modified by Isaiah.

Chapter 11 contains of course a great deal of just plain history. But the constant references to Isaiah, especially Is 10, show what Daniel is doing.¹ He has read Isaiah in such a way that Assyria stands for Syria and Sargon for Antiochos IV. Daniel is therefore giving in this chapter the historical proof that Is 10 has been fulfilled up to a point. It is important to notice that when Daniel goes beyond this point, he relies completely on earlier prophecies: if so much has been fulfilled (of Isaiah, not of Daniel !), the rest will be too. Thus Dn 11:36 comes from Is 10:15, 23, 25. Even the geography of the last battle comes from Is 10:29.

The vision in Chapter 8 is difficult for our conception of Daniel, for it cannot be denied that the vision of the ram and the goat come from Near Eastern astrology, in which a certain constellation is assigned to each nation. Nevertheless, as soon as the vision proceeds to the deeds of the "horn", the reference to Is 14 is unmistakable.

The decisive point for any conception of Daniel is Chapter 7. Against his own will, M. Noth² has shown that to apply literary criticism to this chapter was a mistake from the beginning. His attempt to derive the Son of Man from Enoch, leaving only Vs 2-7 and 11b in the original vision is almost a caricature of literary criticism. Nevertheless, scholars' eyes are still blinded by the idea that at least the tradition behind this chapter must be sought in Babylonian myths. In this chapter we cannot deny the impression of a real vision; many of the details have a dreamlike quality and are probably not to be over-interpreted. We can nevertheless inquire about the state of Daniel's mind which gave the vision just this form. It seems reasonable to suggest a dependence on the Adam speculation³ of that time without positing any direct contact with

¹ The references to Isaiah have been pointed out by E. Bickermann, *Der Gott der Makkabäer*, Berlin, 1937, and I. L. Seeligmann, "Voraussetzungen der Midrash-exegese," *Suppl. to VT* 1 (1953), 150-181.

² M. Noth, "Zur Komposition des Buches Daniel," *ThStKr* 98/99 (1926), 143-163. It is very significant that he abandoned his earlier attempt in "Das Geschichtsverständnis der alttestamentlichen Apokalyptik," *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, München, 1957, pp. 248-273. Unfortunately A. Bentzen, *Daniel*, Tübingen, 1937, pp. 30f, still continues to attempt source criticism, excising Vs 8, 11a, 20-22, 24-25.

³ Cf. the very suggestive little commentary of E. W. Heaton, *The Book of*

the myth of the heavenly man. Out of the deep (cf. Gen 1:2) rise four beasts (cf. Rahab, Leviathan, the serpent) who are judged by God (cf. Ps 82), and then dominion is given to "one like a son of man". Who is this son of man? He is the one whom God has "crowned with glory and honor," to whom he has "given dominion" and "put all things under his feet" (Ps 8:6-7). If Gen 1 (and Ps 8) lies behind Dn 7, it may also be the source of the "firmament" and "stars" of 12:3. However, while the Adam figure may provide the background for the form of Daniel's vision, the content of the angelic interpretation points in a different direction.

If the form of Daniel is that of a charismatic interpretation of scripture, derived ultimately from the interpretation of dreams, what of the content of this book? Where does it belong with respect to the history of tradition? Insofar as the Zion tradition is lacking, it seems appropriate to understand Daniel not in terms of his successors in apocalyptic, but rather as an actualization for his time of the exodus tradition and the prophecy of Deutero-Isaiah. In a sense Deutero-Isaiah was the last of the Old Testament prophets. The Old Testament Heilsgeschichte ended with the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C., for after the Babylonian captivity the next great event prophesied could not be surpassed: the new creation in which not only the redemption of Israel but also that of the nations was to be included. When this new creation was delayed, prophecy could not predict anything new, but only try to actualize the old. Already Trito-Isaiah is an actualization, as are Haggai and Zechariah. What these later prophets are saying in effect is that now is the time for the prophecy of Deutero-Isaiah to be fulfilled; hence the *Naherwartung* of these prophets, as of Daniel and the New Testament. The prophecy of Deutero-Isaiah is essentially consolation, *paraklesis*, and in many places we see that even the form is that of a priestly oracle answering a lament. The inserter of the prayer Dn 9:4-19 was no form critic, but he had a sense of what was fitting in this place. The prayer is a typical national lament, and the book of Daniel is an answer to one of the constant questions of this genre: **עַד מַתַּי**, how long?

Let us consider just some of the important themes of Deutero-Isaiah which have been taken up in Daniel. Three can be mentioned:

Daniel, London, 1956, pp. 169ff. On the Adam speculation, cf. Sap 10:1; Sir 49:16, Vita Adae, and B. Marmorstein, "Adam, ein Beitrag zur Messiaslehre," *WZKM* 35 (1928), 242-275.

1. Deutero-Isaiah is the first of the prophets to use a creation tradition (cf. esp. 40:27 ff; 51:9f). The coming redemption will be so great that it will not be enough to speak of a new exodus or a new covenant or a new David—the prophet has to speak of a new creation. The old will pass away and there will be a new heaven and a new earth, and Israel will be exalted over all the nations. It is against this background that we have to understand such Psalms as 74 and 89, where the God who redeems his people from the oppression of foreign powers is seen in terms of his work as creator. And it is for this reason that the redeemed Israel (“the saints of the Most High”) is seen in Dn 7 in a figure derived from Adam and the giving to him of authority over all creation.

2. Closely related to the theme of the creation is the fact that God is Lord of all creation, also of the great empires. Babylon has fallen (Is 47), Antiochos will fall (Dn 7, 11), and the kingship of God over all the nations will be made manifest (Is 45:23; Dn 2:44; 7:14). Nevertheless, it is not the future manifestation as much as the present sovereignty that is emphasized. Deutero-Isaiah can call Cyrus the Anointed of the Lord (45:1), and Nebuchadnezzar is a king to whom “the God of heaven has given the kingdom . . . and into whose hand he has given . . . the sons of men” (Dn 2:37f; cf. 5:18ff). The judgment of Antiochos has already taken place (Dn 7:10f). We should perhaps also mention how it is shown in Deutero-Isaiah that Yahweh and not the gods of the peoples is Lord of the world: it is because he (and his servants are witnesses) can predict the future (Is 41:21-26; 44:6-8).

3. Ever since B. Duhm isolated the Servant songs in Deutero-Isaiah, scholarship has been asking a false question: interpreting the Servant as a Messianic figure, it has sought evidence in pre-Christian Judaism of a doctrine of a suffering Messiah. But it would be better to ask: how were these particular sections of the book of Isaiah interpreted? We find that they were interpreted as an integral part of the book and not Messianically at all, or if “Messianically” (cf. Is 55:3ff), then of the people of Israel. This is not the place to debate the correctness of this interpretation, but we only want to indicate that it was Daniel’s. For him the “servant(s)” are the “saints of the Most High” (7:25), the “people of the saints” (8:24), the “wise” (12:2), who now are “given into the hand” of Antiochos (7:25), “fall by the sword” (11:33), and are “destroyed” (8:24, cf. Is 52:14). But in their suffering and through their knowledge

(cf. Is 53:11), they "make righteous" "the many" (12:2) and "refine" them (11:35, cf. Is 48:10), but then they shall be exalted and "shine like the brightness of the firmament" (12:2), and to them will be given "authority and glory and kingdom" (7:14). Israel described as a Servant of God in Deutero-Isaiah becomes Israel described as a Son of Man in Daniel.

It must be emphasized that we are not speaking of the coalescence of two apocalyptic figures, a Suffering Servant and a Son of Man, for there were no such figures,¹ and we are certainly not speaking of a reinterpretation of the concept of Messiah.² It is only a question of how Daniel interprets certain passages of Deutero-Isaiah. Is 53 says of Israel, or of the righteous within Israel, that through their suffering they would make atonement for sins and through their knowledge they would make the many righteous, and that because of this, therefore "my servant shall be exalted and lifted up" (52:13). Daniel claims that this prophecy is being fulfilled in the Israel of his own day.³ Speaking a word of consolation to a people persecuted by Antiochos Epiphanes, his emphasis is on vindication more than suffering and atonement. Nevertheless, if we read Chapter 7 in connection with Chapters 8-12, these other elements are also present. That Israel is going through a tribulation is clear (cf. of the Son of Man Dn 7:21, 25), but it is also said at one point that this suffering is redemptive. In a statement derived from Is

¹ This is the weak point in the common assertion that either Jesus or the Jewish tradition combined the figures of Suffering Servant and Son of Man: Jeremias, *TWNT*, V, 686f; Cullmann, *Christologie*, p. 164; V. Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, London, 1952, pp. 119f; T. W. Manson, *The Servant Messiah*, Cambridge, 1953, pp. 62ff. For the thesis to be upheld it would have to be restated in terms of Jesus using the language of Dn 7 and Is 53. But then the thesis would fall with the recognition that in fact literary reference to Is 53 is very rare in the gospels; cf. M. D. Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant*, London, 1959.

² W. Manson, *Jesus the Messiah*, London, 1943, esp. pp. 171-174, claims the fusion of three apocalyptic figures: Son of Man, Servant of God, and Messiah. For a thorough refutation of this thesis, cf. H. H. Rowley, "The Suffering Servant and the Davidic Messiah," *The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament*, Oxford, 1965², pp. 63-93.

³ Cf. G. Dalman, *Der leidende und sterbende Messias der Synagoge im ersten nachchristlichen Jahrhundert*, Berlin, 1888, p. 31; H. L. Ginsberg, "The Oldest Interpretation of the Suffering Servant," *VT* 3 (1953), 400-404. Whatever the origin of the phrase "saints of the Most High" (cf. M. Noth, "Die Heiligen des Höchsten," *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, München, 1957, pp. 274-290), in the present text it clearly stands for Israel (or the righteous within Israel) in triumph after defeat (Dn 7:21f), in spite of what Noth says.

48:10 it is said that "some of the wise will fall, to refine and to purify and to whiten them" (11:35). The main emphasis, however, as we said, is on vindication after suffering.¹ The coming of the Son of Man to the Ancient of Days on the clouds of heaven (7:13) is equivalent to "judgment being given for the saints of the Most High" and to the time "when the saints receive the kingdom" (7:22). The coming of the Son of Man in Chapter 7 is the same as the coming of the stone in Chapter 2, for both represent "a kingdom which shall never be destroyed" (2:44; 7:14). The concept of Son of Man in Daniel is very close to that of the kingdom of God.

That the Danielic Son of Man represents an interpretation of the Isaianic Servant in terms of a community progressing through suffering to vindication is shown by the parallel understanding of Qumran.² Their theology as a whole is in terms of the exodus tradition and thus an actualization of Deutero-Isaiah, but there are also specific references which show an interpretation of the Isaianic Servant in a manner parallel to that of Daniel. The men of Qumran are "the saints of the Most High" (CD XX, 7f), "the elect of the holy people" (1QM XII, 1), and "the wise" (maskilim, 1QS III, 3; IX, 12, 21) who "make wise the many in the works of God" (CD XIII, 7). Although the suffering of the community can be interpreted in language derived from Is 53,³ this is not an important aspect of their understanding of themselves as the community which makes atonement for the land. As we saw, this atonement is connected with the conception of the community as the temple. Nevertheless, even with these modifications, the evidence from Qumran is exceedingly important in understanding the background of the New Testament conception of Son of Man. It is not a question of an apocalyptic figure called Son of Man but of the understanding

¹ "The 'one like a son of man' represents the Servant of the Lord as triumphant, not as suffering; but suffering preceded the triumph," W. H. Brownlee, "The Servant of the Lord in the Qumran Scrolls," *BASOR* 132 (1953), 8-15, and 135 (1954), 33-38; quotation p. 15.

² Cf. above, pp. 163-176, and W. H. Brownlee, "Servant"; M. Black, "The Servant of the Lord and the Son of Man," *SJTh* 6 (1953), 1-11; "The Gospels and the Scrolls," *Studia Evangelica* (TU 73), Berlin, 1959, pp. 565-579; *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, London, 1961, pp. 128f; F. F. Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*, den Haag, 1959, pp. 50ff; J. V. Chamberlain, "Toward a Qumran Soteriology," *NT* 3 (1959), 305-313. One can still see traces of this theology among the Karaites; cf. N. Wieder, *The Judean Scrolls and Karaism*, London, 1962.

³ Cf. 1QH VIII, 6-8, 10-12, 23-27; XIII, 18; XIV, 25; XVII, 26.

of Israel, specifically of Israel in the proclamation of Deutero-Isaiah. Both Daniel and Qumran have the same understanding in terms of a suffering—exaltation pattern, although the former expresses this in the figure of the Son of Man and the latter does not. Their understanding, however, is the same, and both agree over against Is 53 in putting greatest emphasis on the exaltation.

The theology of Daniel and his actualization of Deutero-Isaiah was central in Israel's understanding of itself in the period 168 B.C.—135 A.D. From Daniel to Akiba, between the two currents of accommodation to the Hellenistic world and armed resistance to it, the central motif was a theology of martyrdom.¹ Especially important is Is 43-44, chapters which call on Israel as God's chosen servant to be witnesses to his truth in the midst of an idolatrous world. With the witness is bound up suffering, and the stories of Dn 1-6 emphasize that witness unto death is preferable to idolatry. The pressure of persecution and the problem of the death of the martyrs led to apocalyptic with its double orientation: on the one hand vindication for the persecuted and resurrection for the martyred dead, and on the other hand vengeance on the persecutors and on the apostates within Israel. It is not necessary to invoke Iranian influence in order to understand how the struggle came to be seen in cosmic terms, with the persecutor becoming the Anti-Christ and the persecuted the Son of Man. When the two themes of vindication and vengeance are combined, then the persecuted martyr advances from witness to the truth in his death to witness against the persecutors and apostates at the judgment, and finally to being the judge himself. Parallel to this, the witness suffering on behalf of Israel during his lifetime (Is 53) becomes the witness testifying for Israel at the judgment, he becomes a paraclete.² It is only a slight extension of this when it can be said that the death of the righteous

¹ Cf. H. A. Fischel, "Martyr and Prophet," *JQR* 37 (1946), 265-280, 363-386; E. Stauffer, *New Testament Theology*, London, 1963², Appendix I; E. Lohse, *Märtyrer und Gottesknecht*, Göttingen, 1955; E. Schweizer, *Lordship and Discipleship*, London, 1960; A. R. C. Leaney, "The Eschatological Significance of Suffering in the Old Testament and the Dead Sea Scrolls," *SJTh* 16 (1963), 286-296; J. Downing, "Jesus and Martyrdom," *JThSt* 14 (1963), 279-293.

² Cf. N. Johannson, *Parakletoi; Vorstellungen von Fürsprechern für die Menschen vor Gott in der alttestamentlichen Religion, im Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*, Lund, 1940; on the servant of Is 53 as paraclete, pp. 49-62; on the Son of Man as paraclete, pp. 181-255.

witness atones for the sins of Israel.¹ The stories of Eleazar and the mother with seven sons in 2 Maccabees are typical, and we see all the themes summed up in the defiant speech to Antiochos of one of the sons: "I, like my brothers, give up body and life for the laws of our fathers, appealing to God to show mercy soon to our nation and by afflictions and plagues to make you confess that he alone is God, and through me and my brothers to bring to an end the wrath of the Almighty which has justly fallen on our whole nation" (2 Mac 7:37f). Especially important as a background for Mk 10:45 are the even more explicit statements of 4 Maccabees, where Eleazar prays "make my blood a purification (καθάρσιον) for them, and take my life as a ransom (ἀντίψυχον) for theirs" (6:29), or where it is said of the mother and the seven sons, "they became like a ransom for the sins of the nation, and through the blood of those pious ones and the expiation (ἱλαστήριον) of their death, divine providence saved Israel in a desperate situation" (17:21f). Even more emphasized than the atoning quality of the death of the martyrs is their exaltation and vindication. The Assumption of Isaiah and the Assumption of Moses are important for their temporal proximity to the New Testament, but it is not only the martyred prophet who is exalted; cf. Ass Mos 10:8f, "Then you will be happy, my Israel, and be exalted to the heights, to fight the eagle . . . God will exalt you among the stars of heaven in his dwelling place." Finally, all themes are recapitulated in a passage from the Wisdom of Solomon which is directly derived from Is 53:² "The souls of the righteous. . . (whose) departure was thought to be an affliction and their going forth from us to be their destruction. . . are in the hands of God. . . Having been disciplined a little, they will receive great good, because God tested them. . . like gold in the furnace he tried them, and like a sacrificial burnt offering he accepted them. In the time of their visitation they will shine forth and will run like sparks through the stubble. They will govern nations and rule over peoples" (3:1-8).

¹ Cf. Lohse, *Martyrer*, pp. 66-72; Schweizer, *Lordship*, p. 26.

² Cf. also 2:10ff and M. J. Suggs, "Wisdom of Solomon 2:10-15; A Homily based on the Fourth Servant Song," *JBL* 76 (1957), 26-33. The παῖς of 3:13 is understood as a son 3:18, but definitely in a collective sense; cf. 12:7, 20; 19:6. Also Wisdom 5:1-8 is directly dependent on the fourth servant song; cf. 5:1-2 with Is 52:13ff; 5:3-4 with Is 53:2-4; 5:5 with Is 53:12; etc.

Returning now to the gospels and Jesus' use of the phrase Son of Man, let us see how the major problems appear without the common supposition of a heavenly apocalyptic figure as the content of the phrase. There is first the question of whether one concept could be used both in the present tense in reference to suffering and also in the future with reference to a parousia. It seems clear that it could not, but only a preconceived idea of what the concept must mean would lead one to prefer the latter sayings over the former. In an analysis admirable in its clarity and objectivity, E. Schweizer¹ has shown that it is precisely the future sayings which are most suspect in accordance with the canons otherwise used to judge authenticity. Statements concerning the parousia of Jesus in particular, although they can now be phrased in terms of the Son of Man (Mk 13:26) are the product of a long process of development which involved the use of Dn 7 only at a late stage.² If we put aside the title Son of Man and ask how the church interpreted Dn 7 in relationship to Jesus, it is clear that it was in terms of exaltation.

One of the most important issues presently being debated in New Testament scholarship concerns this concept of exaltation in the Palestinean church. On the one hand Cullmann³ and Schweizer⁴ emphasize its great importance for understanding the Christology of the Palestinean church, while on the other hand F. Hahn⁵ is an articulate representative of the view that the Palestinean church thought primarily in terms of the two poles of the earthly Jesus and the parousia, while the exalted Lord was a creation of Hellenistic Christianity. We cannot enter into this discussion here except insofar as the term Son of Man is concerned.⁶

We can begin with the interpretation of Dn 7 in general. In the

¹ E. Schweizer, "Der Menschensohn (Zur eschatologischen Erwartung Jesu)", *ZNW* 50 (1959), 185-209 = *Neotestamentica*, Zürich, 1963, pp. 56-84.

² T. F. Glasson, *The Second Advent: The Origin of the New Testament Doctrine*, London, 1945, has very effectively demonstrated this, whatever one may think of his theological conclusions concerning the parousia as such.

³ Developed in ever more detail ever since it was first stated in *Die ersten christlichen Glaubensbekenntnisse*, Zürich, 1943.

⁴ Especially in *Lordship and Discipleship*.

⁵ *Christologische Hoheitstitel; Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum*, Göttingen, 1963.

⁶ We are of course not speaking of the ascension as a special event but as a theological aspect of the resurrection; cf. A. M. Ramsey, "What Was the Ascension?," *SNTS Bulletin* 2 (1951), 43-50.

second book of his *Testimonies* ¹ Cyprian quotes under the heading "that after he had risen again he should receive from his Father all power, and his power should be everlasting" first Dn 7:13-14, but also Is 33:10f, Ps 110:1f, Rev 1:12-18, and Mt 28:18-20, all clearly exaltation texts. Cyprian's understanding is not only typical of the early church in general when they read Dn 7:13f for itself and not in connection with Mk 13:26, but it is also the natural and correct understanding. In his vision Daniel saw that "with the clouds of heaven there came one like a son of man, and he arrived at the Ancient of Days and was brought before him; and to him was given authority (שלטן) and glory and kingdom, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him. His authority is an everlasting authority which shall not pass away, and his kingdom one which shall not be destroyed" (7:13f). Whatever the background of this statement, ² in its present context it can refer only to the exaltation of a human figure from earth to heaven, the vindication of the persecuted saints of the Most High. ³ To be sure, the scene is a "parousia" scene temporally, but the one who appears to conduct the judgment is the Ancient of Days, not the Son of Man, and geographically the motion of the latter is up and not down. Apart from the temporal aspect, of the two events Jesus' exaltation and parousia, Dn 7:13f would most appropriately describe the former.

Mt 28:18-20 can be understood best against the background of Dn 7:13f, for it has been formulated quite consciously in terms of this text: "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Go therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing

¹ II, 26; translation in *Ante Nicene Fathers*, Vol. V, pp. 525f.

² A. Bentzen, *Daniel*, p. 30, is misled by the supposed background to speak of a descent in the present text.

³ Cf. T. W. Manson, "The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch, and the Gospels," *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles*, Manchester, 1962, pp. 123-145, p. 126, "It cannot be too strongly emphasized that what Daniel portrays is not a divine, semi-divine, or angelic figure coming down from heaven, to bring deliverance, but a human figure going up to heaven to receive it;" C. F. D. Moule, "From Defendant to Judge—and Deliverer," *SNTS Bulletin* 3 (1952), 40-53, p. 45, "The 'Son of Man' already means the representative of God's chosen people, destined through suffering to be exalted;" V. Taylor, *Mark*, p. 569, "The emphasis lies on enthronement, and on enthronement as the symbol of triumph;" Heaton, *Daniel*, p. 183, "He came not from God but to him. He . . . symbolizes the faithful members of Israel. The humiliation which they are now suffering is the beginning of their triumph."

them. . . ¹ and teaching them to observe all I have taught you. And behold, I am with you all the days to the end of the age." This text, with its Semitisms ("all the days" = forever) is clearly dependent on the Aramaic text of Dn 7:13f. O. Michel ² has shown how "all authority has been given to me" corresponds to the authority given to the Son of Man; the nations which are "therefore" made disciples correspond to the nations which serve the Son of Man; and Jesus is with his followers "all the days to the end of the age" because the authority of the Son of Man is everlasting and his kingdom one which shall not be destroyed. Although neither word appears, Mt 28:18ff is very important in showing the connection between kingdom of God and Son of Man in the synoptic gospels.

The understanding of Dn 7:13f shown in Mt 28:18ff has led to the use of an "enthronement formula" in the New Testament. J. Jeremias ³ has discussed this formula as it appears in 1 Tim 3:16 and finds that it contains not only the elements of exaltation and enthronement but also proclamation to the nations. That this formula has been used in the New Testament is because of the connection of the Gentile mission with the concept of Son of Man, whom "all peoples, nations, and languages should serve." O. Michel ⁴ discusses the same formula in connection with Heb 1:5-14, and it is to be found elsewhere in the New Testament (e.g. Rev 4-5). Especially important in this connection is the hymn of Phil 2:5-11. As Lohmeyer has shown, ⁵ it not only goes back to the Aramaic speaking church but seems to speak specifically of the exaltation of the Son of Man in Dn 7:13f. When we read with ἡ⁴⁶ ἐν ὁμοιότητι ἀνθρώπου in Vs 7, this could very well represent the Aramaic

¹ On the omission here of the trinitarian baptismal formula, cf. H. Kosmala, "The Conclusion of Matthew," *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute*, Leiden, Vol. IV, 1965, pp. 132-147.

² O. Michel, "Der Abschluss des Matthäusevangeliums," *EvTh* 10 (1950), 16-26; cf. his "Menschensohn und Völkerwelt," *EMZ* 2 (1941), 257-267; E. Lohmeyer, "Mir ist gegeben alle Gewalt! Eine Exegese von Mt. 28, 16-20," *In Memoriam Ernst Lohmeyer*, Stuttgart, 1951, pp. 22-49; *Das Evangelium des Matthäus* (ed. W. Schmauch), Göttingen, 1958², pp. 412-426.

³ J. Jeremias, *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus* (NTD), Göttingen, 1949, p. 21.

⁴ O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, Göttingen, 1957¹⁰, p. 54.

⁵ E. Lohmeyer, *Kyrios Jesus. Eine Untersuchung zu Phil 2, 5-11*, Heidelberg, 1927/28; cf. *Der Brief an die Philipper, an die Kolosser und an Philemon*, Göttingen, 1956¹¹, p. 95.

כְּבִרְאֻשׁ.¹ In any case the hymn is evidence that the Aramaic church spoke of Jesus' exaltation, and Dn 7:13f is the most appropriate Old Testament text with which to express this concept.

We can assume a connection with Dn 7 whenever exaltation is combined with riding on clouds.² Thus while Rev 1:7; 14:14 can speak of the parousia of the Son of Man³ on a cloud,⁴ a cloud is also used in connection with the exaltation after suffering of the two witnesses: "they went up into heaven in the cloud, and their enemies saw them" (11:12). Also the ascension of Jesus is by means of a cloud: "While they were looking, he was taken up, and a cloud received him from their eyes" (Acts 1:9). To be sure, we hear in this context also of the parousia on a cloud: "This Jesus who was taken up from you into heaven, he will come in the same manner in which you saw him going into heaven" (1:11). Here we see an important transition. The use of the Son of Man coming on a cloud to refer to the parousia of Jesus presupposes an earlier usage in which it referred to his exaltation into heaven.⁵

For the sake of completeness, we can just list here the Johannine Son of Man sayings:

- 1) Truly, truly, I say to you, you will see heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man. (1:51)
- 2) No one has ascended into heaven but he who descended from heaven, the Son of Man. (3:13)

¹ So Lohmeyer, *Philippus*, p. 95; Moule, "Defendant to Judge," M. Black, "The Son of Man Problem in Recent Research and Debate," *Bull. Jn. Ryl. Lib.* 45 (1962-63), 305-318. There may have been an intermediate form בְּרִישׁוֹת בְּרִישׁוֹת, but cf. Rev 1:13 *ὁμοιον ὄντι ἀνθρώπου*, and 4 Es 13:3, quasi similitudinem hominis. Cullmann, *Christologie*, pp. 178ff, sees here not only a reference to the Son of Man of Dn 7 but also to the Servant of Is 53.

² The connection must be through Dn 7, for as Oepke, *TWNT* IV, 911, 24f, says, "Vehikel des Entrücktwerdenden war die Wolke ursprünglich nicht."

³ The title Son of Man can also designate the exalted Christ, as in 1:13.

⁴ The root of this way of speaking is the tradition behind the synoptic apocalypse, since Rev 1:7 combines Dn 7:13 and Zech 12:10 in a single testimony, as does Mt 24:30.

⁵ Indirect evidence of the fact that the church interpreted the Son of Man of the ascension of Jesus is provided by a statement of Rabbi Abbahu (c. 300 A.D.) in pTaan 65b, "Wenn jemand sagt, 'Ich bin Gott,' so lügt er; 'Ich bin der Menschensohn,' so wird er es bereuen; 'Ich steige zum Himmel empor,' so hat er es gesagt und wird es nicht vollführen" (Strack, *Jesus, die Häretiker und die Christen nach den ältesten jüdischen Angaben*, Leipzig, 1910, p. 37*).

- 3) And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of Man be lifted up. (3:14)
- 4) (The Father) has given him (the Son) authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of Man. (5 : 27)
- 5) . . . the food which endures to eternal life, which the Son of Man will give to you. (6:27)
- 6) Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you have no life in you. (6:53)
- 7) What if you were to see the Son of Man ascending to where he was before? (6:62)
- 8) When you have lifted up the Son of Man, then you will know that I am He, and that I do nothing on my own authority but speak thus as the Father taught me. (8:28)
- 9) The hour has come for the Son of Man to be glorified. (12:23)
- 10) How can you say that the Son of Man must be lifted up? Who is this Son of Man? (12:34)
- 11) Now is the Son of Man glorified. (13:31)

None of these sayings has anything to do with the parousia, although saying "4" does refer to the judgment. The vast majority however speak in terms of the exaltation and glorification of the Son of Man (sayings 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11).¹ C. H. Dodd has argued² that the term Son of Man in the Fourth Gospel has collective connotations of the new community in Christ. While this can serve as a corroboration, the Johannine concept has enough specific differences to make advisable the confining of our discussion to the synoptic sayings.³

Of the two explicit quotations of Dn 7:13 in the gospels, Mk 13:26 clearly refers to the parousia. As we have seen,⁴ however, this is found in a passage which shows the results of the midrash of the early church and in no sense represents an early tradition. We shall see that Mark included it because he was interested in drawing a parallel between the parousia and the resurrection-ascension. The parallel to Mk 13:26 is the second explicit quotation Mk 14:62, and it seems clear that from the perspective of history of tradition the latter passage is earlier and the source of the former. When asked by Caiaphas if he was "the Anointed, the Son of the Blessed,"

¹ Cf. E. Schweizer, "Der Menschensohn (Zur eschatologischen Erwartung Jesu), *Neotestamentica*, Zürich, 1963, pp. 56-84.

² *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge, 1953, pp. 241-249.

³ We hope to have shown above how important the concept of ascension is in the Jewish-Christian Proto-Luke apart from the title Son of Man; cf. also H. Flender, *Heil und Geschichte in der Theologie des Lukas*, München, 1965, pp. 85ff.

⁴ Cf. above, pp. 30-35.

Jesus replied, "I am,¹ and from now on² you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of Power and coming with the clouds of heaven." It is best not to try to read this statement as a genuine saying of Jesus but rather as an interpretation by the church of his resurrection. At the very moment when Jesus stands before the High Priest to be condemned by him, there is reference to Jesus' exaltation, when seated at the right hand of God he will be a witness for the prosecution to condemn Caiaphas at the judgment. Jesus' vindication after his death, his exaltation has here been interpreted through the use of Ps 110:1 and Dn 7:13.³ When we consider Ps 110, there can be no doubt that the reference is to exaltation, found here in an early text (cf. "Power" as a paraphrasis for God). Hahn's thesis that exaltation is a theologoumenon of the Hellenistic church will not stand, for the superior arguments of Lindars show that the concept of exaltation using Ps 110 goes back to the earliest period of the church.⁴ If Ps 110 has been used in this way, then the other testimonium, Dn 7:13, must have the same meaning. In the first place, this understanding alone is in accordance with the context here and in Daniel, as has been argued very persuasively by Glasson.⁵ "In the earliest period the Daniel passage was used to express the vindication of Jesus in the Resurrection."⁶ It is very improbable that two different events should be referred to here: first exaltation and then parousia,⁷ and since the two texts

¹ Lohmeyer, *Markus*, p. 328; Taylor, *Mark*, p. 568; and J. A. T. Robinson, *Jesus and His Coming*, London, 1957, p. 49 think that we should read here as in the parallel account of Matthew σὺ εἶπας. Cullmann, *Christologie*, pp. 118-120, has shown that this ambiguous answer must in context mean "No" (as in Mk 15:2). But Matthew contains the strong adversative πλὴν whereas Mark has καί. The sense of Mt 26:64 is "I am not the Messiah *but* the Son of Man," while the sense of Mk 14:62 would have to be "I am the Messiah, *i.e.* the Son of Man." The two versions ascribe at this point quite a different content to the title χριστός.

² That this phrase must be read in order to explain the parallels in Matthew and Luke is persuasively argued by Glasson, *Advent*, pp. 66-68, and Robinson, *Coming*, pp. 47-51.

³ Cf. O. Linton, "The Trial of Jesus and the Interpretation of Psalm CX," *NTS* 7 (1960-61), 258-262.

⁴ Lindars, *Apologetic*, pp. 42-51.

⁵ Glasson, *Advent*, pp. 63-68; cf. Robinson, *Coming*, pp. 48f.

⁶ Lindars, *Apologetic*, p. 48; cf. N. Perrin, "Mark 14.62: End Product of a Christian Peshet Tradition?," *NTS* 12 (1965-66), 150-155.

⁷ H. K. McArthur, "Mark xiv. 62," *NTS* 4 (1958), 156-158; cf. the reply by Glasson, "The Reply to Caiaphas (Mark xiv. 62), *NTS* 7 (1960), 88-93. Also Hahn, *Hoheitstitel*, p. 182f, agrees that there cannot be two references,

refer to one event, the order in which they are cited is irrelevant.¹ Mk 14:62 is not to be interpreted in the light of the parousia usage of Dn 7, but on the contrary, Mk 13:26 is to be interpreted in the light of the exaltation usage here. We have assumed that neither is a genuine saying of Jesus, but then the question arises concerning the connection of these sayings with his teaching. Also the origin of parousia language and concepts must be considered. First, however, there are two other important texts where Ps 110:1 and Dn 7:13 are combined.

Just before his death the martyr Stephen is granted a vision of the glory of God and Jesus in heaven. He said, "Behold, I see the heavens opened and the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God" (Acts 7:56). As the differences with respect to the parallel Vs 55 (where "heaven" is singular) show, this saying is a pre-Lucan formulation.² Here too we find the title Son of Man (Dn 7:13) combined with a statement about the right hand of God (Ps 110:1). Here too we find the saying expressed at the very moment a man stand before his earthly judges about to be condemned and killed. The title Son of Man is very infrequent outside the sayings of Jesus, so that it is all the more significant that it appears here in a martyrdom scene. There is another such case in connection with the martyrdom of James. Just before he is killed, he says, "Why do you ask me concerning the Son of Man? He is sitting in heaven at the right hand of the great Power, and he will come on the clouds of heaven."³ This text, which shows Semitic influence, nevertheless differs from Mk 14:62 in that here with a present and a future verb (κάθεται, μέλλει ἔρχεσθαι) there really does seem to be reference to both exaltation and parousia. We are more interested however in the fact that this is the third case where Dn 7:13 and Ps 110:1 are combined in connection with the death of a martyr. This is in itself natural enough, as Dn 7 is one of the most important documents of the martyr theology. There, after the persecution of the saints, God arrives for the last judgment, and "judgment was given for the saints of the Most High" (7:22). In the judgment they

but in line with his refusal to see exaltation in an early text, he says that also Ps 110 refers here to the parousia!

¹ Mark then does not differ greatly from the earlier version of Proto-Luke, where only the Ps 110 testimonium is used: "From now on the Son of Man will be sitting at the right hand of Power" (Lk 22:69).

² Cf. Tödt, *Menschensohn*, pp. 274-276.

³ Hegesippus, in Eusebius, H. E., II, xxiii, 13.

are vindicated (they receive the kingdom, 7:13, 18, 27), but their former oppressors are condemned ("his dominion shall be taken away, to be consumed and destroyed to the end" 7:26). If we think of the saints giving testimony of their own suffering in the case against their persecutors, then they are not only vindicated themselves but they become witnesses in the case of their oppressors. Of course, their testimony could also be on the other side, in the case of those who had acted properly toward them, and they could become witnesses for the defense. It is not to be denied that the Son of Man has distinct connotations of acting as a witness, a paraclete, in the last judgment.¹ This then is the meaning of the visions of Stephen and James, that at the very moment when their earthly judges condemn them they are assured that at the last judgment Jesus will give testimony in their behalf. It is for this reason that instead of sitting as in Ps 110:1 the Son of Man is described as standing in Acts 7:56.² While this is undoubtedly the proper explanation of Acts 7:56 (and of the similar situation of James), it involves a conception, that of Jesus as paraclete, which does not appear in Mk 14:62. It may be that we can posit an earlier conception, which would unite all three texts and which would bring them closer to the situation in Daniel, where the Son of Man is only the vindicated victim. This would involve the collective interpretation in which all three, Jesus and Stephen and James, look forward to their own vindication at the last judgment. While the concept of witness is an important secondary development, the primary reference of Son of Man is in terms of vindication after suffering.

We have seen that Mk 14:62 must be understood in terms of vindication and exaltation. This text has nothing to do with the parousia, in which Jesus will come down from heaven to earth. Nevertheless, the eschatological element in both this text and Daniel cannot be denied. It will not do to interpret Mk 14:62 as being exhaustively fulfilled in the historical ascension of Jesus as an event before the end, and Acts 7:56 refers to more than a vision granted to a martyr before his individual death. While Dn 7 may speak of the ascent rather than the descent of the Son of Man, nevertheless the scene is of the last judgment and there is a parousia:

¹ Cf. Moule, "Defendant to Judge."

² Cf. T. Preiss, "The Mystery of the Son of Man," *Life in Christ*, London, 1954, pp. 43-60, p. 50; Moule, "Defendant to Judge," pp. 46f; Cullmann, *Christologie*, p. 188.

the theophany of the Ancient of Days. When Stephen "sees" the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God, while the reference is not to the parousia it is to the last judgment. Again, while the reference is not to Jesus the judge descending, when the High Priest is told that he will "see" the Son of Man seated at the right hand of God, this means that he will experience the last judgment. Our concern here is to emphasize that Dn 7 and all the passages dependent on it, with the exception of Mk 13:26, speak of exaltation to God in the clouds. The parousia on the other hand would mean coming down as in the Old Testament theophanies where God descends (ירד) on a cloud (Ex 34:5; Num 11:25; 12:5; Ps 18:10). We hear of such a descent (καταβαίνω) in 1 Thes 4:16, but it is not in terms of language derived from Dn 7.¹ Apart from the theological consequences he draws, Glasson² should be held to have decisively demonstrated the fact that the language of the parousia in the New Testament is derived from Old Testament descriptions of theophanies and not from the Son of Man of Dn 7. The Son of Man is a figure who ascends, but this ascension occurs at the end of the world. It thus becomes apparent how easy the transition from Mk 14:62 to Mk 13:26 would be. As soon as ascension and parousia are seen as two distinct events, Dn 7 would apply to the former with respect to exaltation but also to the latter with respect to time. In the teaching of Jesus, however, there would not be this separation, but the title Son of Man would refer to an eschatological ascension at the end of time. Thus while we agree with the thesis of E. Schweizer that the genuine Son of Man sayings in the teaching of Jesus refer to suffering and exaltation and not to the parousia, he does not appreciate fully this eschatological component. He also does not succeed in explaining the fact that Son of Man and kingdom of God are never combined in one saying in the synoptic gospels.

In order to meet Vielhauer's very real difficulty a more radical approach from that of Schweizer is necessary. We can agree with Schweizer that Son of Man refers to an exaltation to God, a vindication after suffering, but now we must raise the question of the content of the phrase: who is meant by the Son of Man in the teaching of Jesus? Vielhauer is right in his general assumption that Jesus

¹ In that passage too the Son of Man ascends on clouds; cf. below, pp. 407-408.

² Glasson, *Advent*, Part III, "The Parousia in the Early Church," especially pp. 157-171.

spoke of his mission and not of himself, but he then concludes that Jesus could not have spoken of the Son of Man. Another possible conclusion, however, is that therefore the phrase Son of Man refers not to Jesus at all but rather exclusively to his mission. There is no saying of Jesus joining the words "I" and "Son of Man", and we can agree that Jesus was then referring to someone else by the term, even if it was not the fantastic figure proposed by those who interpret the gospels in the light of Enoch. Again, Viehauer concludes from his observation that no synoptic saying connects the concepts kingdom of God and Son of Man that therefore one set of sayings must be secondary. Another possible conclusion, however, is that therefore the two phrases are used by Jesus synonymously. Surprising¹ as this conclusion may seem, it is in accordance with the usage of Daniel, and it will be our thesis. Jesus used the phrase Son of Man to refer not to himself but to the community he came to call into existence, which was to undergo first suffering and then exaltation.

The collective interpretation of the concept Son of Man was argued very persuasively by T.W. Manson in a series of works, but ultimately he was not able to be completely convincing. His basic thesis, from which he never wavered, was stated thus in 1931: "The 'Son of Man' in the Gospels is the final term in a series of conceptions, all of which are to be found in the Old Testament. These are: the Remnant (Isaiah), the Servant of Jehovah (II Isaiah), the 'I' of the Psalms, and the Son of Man (Daniel). . . . The Son of Man is, like the Servant of Jehovah, an ideal figure and stands for the manifestation of the Kingdom of God on earth in a people wholly devoted to their heavenly King. . . . The restriction of the denotation of the term is the outcome of the prophetic ministry of Jesus. His mission is to create the Son of Man, the Kingdom of the saints of the Most High, to realize in Israel the ideal contained in the term. This task is attempted in two ways: first by public appeal to the people. . . then when this appeal produced no adequate response, by the consolidation of his own band of followers. Finally, . . . he stands alone, embodying in his own person the perfect human response

¹ My reaction on first learning of the collective interpretation of the concept Son of Man from T. W. Manson could be compared to that of Daniel when he first learned this collective interpretation from the angel: "As for me, my thoughts greatly alarmed me, and my color changed, but I kept the matter in my mind" (Dn 7:28).

to the regal claim of God."¹ The great importance of Manson's statement lies in his all but explicit identification of Son of Man and kingdom of God, a solution which Vielhauer should have taken more seriously. The essential weakness in Manson's presentation is that it is dependent on Mark being a basically accurate outline of the life of Jesus. The term Son of Man shifts in meaning from "the Galilean springtime",² when it referred to the whole community³ through the special teaching on suffering for the disciples after Peter's confession⁴ down to Mk 14:62, where "the Son of Man becomes an individual person. . . by the logic of facts. . . (Jesus) alone is equal to the claims of the Son of Man ideal."⁵ Not only is such a development untenable in the light of our present understanding of the nature of the gospel tradition, but the very fact that Manson must posit a development is a confession that he can find no unified concept underlying the Son of Man sayings. A similar equivocation concerning the meaning of the term lies in the introduction of the concept of "corporate personality".⁶ While much that is said in this category about Hebrew thought is illuminating and even applicable to Jesus in general, when focussed specifically on the phrase Son of Man it seems like an attempt to have one's cake and eat it too. In contrast, our thesis will seek to avoid the ambiguities of both the development and the oscillation of meaning theories. It will be this, that when the evangelists use the phrase

¹ T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, Cambridge, r.p. 1963, pp. 227f. In an added note (p. 332) he refers very appropriately to the similar conception of *αὐτοβασιλεία*, where the kingdom of God, a collective concept, is finally restricted to Jesus alone.

² Manson uses this exact phrase, *The Servant Messiah*, Cambridge, r.p. 1961, p. 68. If in this he comes close to the conception of C. J. Cadoux, *The Historic Mission of Jesus*, London, 1941, on the other hand Cadoux is one of the few to have adopted Manson's collective interpretation.

³ In "Mark 2:27f," *Coniectanea Neotestamentica* 11 (1947), 138-146, Manson corrected his earlier statement in *Teaching*, p. 214, that Mk 2:10, 28 refer to mankind in general.

⁴ Stated most powerfully in "Realized Eschatology and the Messianic Secret," *Studies in the Gospels; Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, Oxford, 1955, pp. 209-222. Unfortunately Manson does not carry his own collective concept of the Son of Man to its final conclusion because he ultimately still insists on reading the gospels as biographies. Thus he does not really believe that the Messianic secret is a literary device of Mark, and he finally defines it as: "the Ministry of Jesus *is* the kingdom and the power and the glory for ever and ever" (p. 222).

⁵ *Teaching*, pp. 267f.

⁶ *Servant Messiah*, p. 74, with references; cf. also Schweitzer, *Lordship*, Appendix 2.

Son of Man they use it nearly consistently as a designation of Jesus, but when Jesus used the phrase he used it just as consistently as a designation of the community he came to found.¹

In speaking of the Son of Man we are then not writing a chapter in a life of Jesus but rather seeking to solve a problem in terms of tradition history. We have already seen that the Son of Man in Daniel is a collective concept referring to the suffering and vindication of Israel, and that the application of Dn 7:13f to the parousia of Jesus is a very late introduction into the tradition. It is possible to understand the transition from witness to judgment and from the collective to the individual concept, while the opposite procedure is much more inconceivable. However, there are two reasons why even after the elimination of the parousia sayings the Son of Man in the remainder cannot be simply equated with the Danielic concept. In the first place the restriction of the term to Jesus in the understanding of the evangelists has led to a modification also in the content of the sayings. If the original reference of the Son of Man sayings as Jesus said them was collective, this can only be inferred from their present form. While this procedure is not without risk, there are enough indications especially in the Marcan sayings of an earlier collective understanding to make it feasible. Second, Jesus did not simply appropriate a ready-made concept but he interpreted Dn 7 in terms of his own understanding of his mission. There is one unmistakable reference to and correction of Dn 7:14 ("peoples, nations, and languages should serve him") in Mk 10:45, "The Son of Man came not to be served but to serve. . ." There is then something in Jesus' conception of the Son of Man which is not self-evident on the basis of Dn 7 but which has to be elucidated. This something seems to consist in a greater emphasis on service and suffering, a theme which is perhaps latent in the text of Daniel but whose importance has to be taught. In this connection it is significant that the Markan predictions of the passion do not begin with the statement that Jesus said the Son of Man must suffer, but rather "he began to *teach* them that the Son of Man must suffer many things" (8:31; cf. 9:31, "he was teaching his disciples"). With these qualifications then let us turn to the synoptic sayings themselves.

¹ "Jesus and his disciples represent the Son of Man, 'the saints of the Most High', destined to inherit the kingdom with the inevitable concomitant of suffering," A. R. C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning*, Philadelphia, 1966, p. 214.

Since we devoted Chapter IV to the theology of Proto-Luke, perhaps it would be indicated for us to begin with the Son of Man sayings in this document. After the elimination of all the sayings in Luke's present gospel which have been taken over from Mark (Lk 5:24; 6:5; 9:22, 26, 44; 18:31; 21:27; 22:22; 24:7) and those which we have shown to be editorial additions of Luke (Lk 12:40; 17:22, 24, 26, 30; 18:8; 21:36),¹ we are left with the following:

- 1) Blessed are you when men hate you, and when they exclude you and revile you, and cast out your name as evil, on account of the Son of Man. (6:22)
- 2) The Son of Man has come eating and drinking; and you say, 'Behold, a glutton and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and sinners.' (7:34)
- 3) Foxes have holes and birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man has nowhere to lay his head. (9:58)
- 4) For as Jonah became a sign to the men of Nineveh, so will the Son of Man be to this generation. (11:30)
- 5) And I tell you, everyone who acknowledges me before men, the Son of Man will also acknowledge before the angels of God. (12:8)
- 6) And every one who speaks a word against the Son of Man will be forgiven; but he who blasphemes against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven. (12:10)
- 7) For the Son of Man came to seek and to save the lost. (19:10)
- 8) Judas, would you betray the Son of Man with a kiss? (22:48)
- 9) From now on the Son of Man shall be seated at the right hand of Power. (22:69)

We have at once to make a number of negative observations. First, the traditional division of the sayings into present, suffering, and parousia categories breaks down completely. There are no parousia sayings at all, and indeed only two sayings which could be called future. Saying 9 speaks of the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God, and 5 speaks of the role of the Son of Man as a witness in the judgment. Both of these are discussed in connection with their Markan counterparts. Second, there are no specific passion sayings, even though 3 and 8 of course imply that Jesus lived a homeless life and was delivered up to death. When Jesus speaks of his own death in Proto-Luke it is in terms of the prophet who must die, and the Proto-Lucan understanding is in terms not of the Son of Man but of the Christ who must suffer.² Third, while most of the sayings are in the "present" category, there seems to be no content to the term Son of Man: there would be no change in

¹ Cf. above, pp. 325, 350, 353, 357.

² Cf. above, pp. 291-292.

the Proto-Lucan understanding if we simply substituted the words "I, Jesus" for "Son of Man" in these sayings. While it is perhaps possible to read a collective understanding into most of the sayings, there is no indication that we should do so. Fourth, not one of these sayings makes any reference to Dn 7. If Jesus' interpretation of this passage was considered important by some in the church, it evidently left few traces in Proto-Luke. If we had only these passages to work with, the term Son of Man would remain a complete mystery both with respect to its origins and to the specific understanding Jesus or the church had of the term. This makes the particular Markan understanding all the more important.

Mark too uses the phrase Son of Man as a self-designation of Jesus, but there are constant indications that he was aware also of the collective usage and was consciously paralleling the two. The way in which he does this shows that the application of sayings concerning the suffering of the Son of Man to Jesus is a new interpretation, which actually presupposes the collective meaning. To begin with the two "present" sayings, these two passages as we have seen positively require a collective interpretation. The controversy stories in Mk 2:1 - 3:6 were told in order to justify current practices of the church, and the conclusion

"therefore the Son of Man is lord even over the Sabbath" (2:28)

makes sense as a justification of the disciples' action in plucking ears of wheat on the Sabbath only if "Son of Man" and "disciples" are synonymous. The same is true of the statement

"the Son of Man on earth has authority to forgive sins" (2:10),

as the sense of the argument and the Matthean conclusion (God had given such authority to men, Mt 9:8) show. Of course the disciples have their authority to forgive and over the Sabbath only because of Jesus' prior authority which has been given to them, but it is clearly the disciples and not Jesus to whom the phrase Son of Man refers. It is significant that this usage is established early in Mark before we come to the "suffering" sayings. The presumption is that when Mark uses "suffering" Son of Man sayings to refer to Jesus' death and resurrection and future Son of Man sayings to refer to Jesus' parousia that this is quite definitely a later application having no basis in Jesus' own understanding.

The three Markan "predictions of the passion" are called by

Bultmann¹ "vaticinia ex eventu", but both phrases are very misleading, for it is not a case of a prediction at all. The function of these sayings is not the biographical one of showing how Jesus foretold his own death but the literary one of anticipating what will be told in chapters 14-15, in order to cast light on the teaching of chapters 9-10. It is then important to take note of the context of the "predictions". Just after Peter's Satanic suggestion that Jesus should fulfill the role of the Messiah and just before the most impressive collection of sayings predicting suffering for the disciples comes the first:

- 1) And he began to teach them that the Son of Man must suffer many things and be rejected by the elders and the chief priests and the scribes and be killed and after three days rise. (8:31)

The second comes to introduce a situation in which the disciples discussed which was the greatest.

- 2) For he was teaching his disciples and said to them: The Son of Man is delivered into the hands of men and they will kill him, and when he is killed after three days he will rise. (9:31)

The third follows sayings predicting persecution for the disciples and serves to introduce another pericope concerning greatness.

- 3) And taking again the twelve he began to tell them what would happen to him: Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and the Son of Man will be delivered up to the chief priests and the scribes, and they will condemn him to death and they will deliver him up to the Gentiles, and they will mock him and spit on him and scourge him and kill him and after three days he will rise. (10:32-34)

Particularly this last statement is an obvious summary of Mk 14-15, and there are grounds for the assumption that this is the case with all three. Although in no sense vaticinia ex eventu, these three anticipations of the passion story are to be considered a literary device of Mark and not genuine sayings of Jesus. This is not to say that Jesus could not have foreseen his own death, for we have ample evidence in other sayings that he did; but, and this is the important point, Jesus does not speak of his death in terms of the Son of Man (if any "title" is indicated it is that of the prophet). If these three sayings then are not genuine sayings of Jesus but Markan anticipations of the passion story, we are faced with the immediate question of why Mark designated the subject as Son of Man.

¹ *Syn. Trad.*, pp. 163f.

In seeking an answer to the question of why the Son of Man should be associated in Mark's mind with Jesus' death, it will be helpful to list some other "suffering" sayings.

- 4) . . . when the Son of Man rises from the dead (9:9)
- 5) It is written of the Son of Man that he should suffer many things and be treated with contempt. (9:12)
- 6) The Son of Man goes as is written of him, but woe to that man through whom the Son of Man is delivered up. (14:21)
- 7) Behold, the Son of Man is delivered up into the hands of sinners. (14:41)

Here too the death and resurrection of Jesus are associated for some reason with the term Son of Man, and we are confronted with the task of finding a plausible reason for this. We also notice that a number of phases from the three "predictions" recur, and it is to these phrases that we now direct our attention, following the careful analysis of Tödt.¹ We shall seek to determine whether or not there is any source for the sayings besides the name Son of Man and the details of the passion story, and we shall do this by elimination of everything whose source is only Mk 14-15. The people into whose hands Jesus is delivered and the things they do to him can be immediately eliminated, but some of the other phrases are more problematical.

a) "It is written (of the Son of Man)" (sayings 5, 6; cf. 1 (δεῖ), 1, 2 (διδάσκω)). To say that the Markan passion story contains occasional references to the fulfillment of scripture (14:27, 49) does not outweigh the obvious fact that this is the one phrase which most appropriately would be associated with the Son of Man. Where it is written is of course primarily in Dn 7 and not in Is 53 (even though the latter may in fact have been the basis of the former).

b) "(The Son of Man) will suffer many things" (sayings 1, 5). This phrase is much too vague to be derived exclusively from the passion story, and in spite of the fact that there seems to be no direct Semitic equivalent, it seems to fit best into the martyr theology dependent on Daniel.

c) "(The Son of Man) will be delivered into the hands of men" (sayings 2, 3, 6, 7). There is much to be said for a pre-Markan origin of this phrase. It is a striking Semitism² and may even

¹ Tödt, *Menschensohn*, pp. 141-203.

² Cf. Büchsel, *TWNT*, II, 172.

contain an Aramaic play on words (בר נשא/בני נשא).¹ On the other hand, the word παραδίδωμι is very frequent in the Markan passion story (14:10, 11, 18, 42, 44; 15:1, 10, 15) and in the usage of the early church (Acts 3:13; Rm 4:25; 8:32; 1 Cor 11:23), and it is very well possible that the phrase in the Son of Man sayings is only a reflection of passion story language.

d) "(The Son of Man) will be rejected / treated with contempt" (sayings 1, 5). Many scholars have assumed that ἐξουθενέω comes from the נבזה of Is 53:3,² but it is not immediately apparent why it should be associated with the Son of Man. When we note that the word is found Acts 4:11 in a translation of Ps 118:22, while the similar word ἀποδοκιμάζω is found Mk 12:10; 1 Pet 2:4, 7 in a variant translation of the same Ps 118:22, the origin of these words is clear. We have discussed the great importance of Ps 118:22 for understanding Jesus' death, but it has of course nothing to do with the Son of Man.

e) "(The Son of Man) will be killed" (sayings 1, 2, 3). This word is strange, for the proper expression in light of the passion story would be σταυρώω. Therefore we conclude that the word is associated more with the Son of Man than with the passion story.

f) "(The Son of Man) will rise after three days" (sayings 1, 2, 3; 4 ("from the dead")). The words μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέραις represent the most significant phrase of all, as can be seen immediately by a synoptic comparison. Although the "predictions" are otherwise taken over by Matthew and Luke almost verbatim, in this case they alter Mark's words in every instance to τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. Not only that, but whenever the day of Jesus' resurrection is mentioned in the New Testament it is always said to be "on the third day" (Mt 12:40; Lk 24:7, 46; Acts 10:40; 1 Cor 15:4). This means that Mark too would have written "on the third day" had he been thinking only of the resurrection and not of something else. This something else can only be a Son of Man saying which Mark has secondarily interpreted of the death and resurrection of Jesus. We are given an important indication of what the Son of Man saying might have been about in the use of the similar expression "in three days" in another saying of Jesus which has come down to us in several forms: "I will destroy this temple and in three days I will

¹ Cf. Jeremias, *TWNT*, V, 711. He claims, p. 708, not very successfully that the word goes back to the Targum Is 53:5, אַתְּמָסָר.

² The most convincing argument is by Jeremias, *TWNT*, V, 704.

build it" (Mk 14:58; 15:29; Jn 2:19). We have discussed this saying at length and concluded that the temple which Jesus will build "in three days" represents the eschatological community.

We began with the assertion that the Markan "predictions of the passion" were summaries of the passion story. We then asked whether there was any other source and whether the words "Son of Man" added anything but the mere name, and we have discovered that some of the phrases in these predictions seem to be more closely associated with the Son of Man than with Mk 14-15. Putting aside for the moment Mark's reasons for doing so, it seems that he has chosen to reinterpret already existing Son of Man sayings in terms of the passion. That this is a reinterpretation seems to be indicated by the fact that Jesus otherwise does not speak of his own death in terms of the Son of Man and that there is nothing inherent in the term to suggest this usage. If we put together those phrases in these sayings we have determined to be older than Mark's reinterpretation, we will have an artificial creation but one which will indicate the tenor of the earlier saying(s): "It is written of the Son of Man that he will suffer many things (and be delivered into the hands of men?) and be killed and after three days will rise."

Finally, there is one more suffering saying which is important for our thesis that the Son of Man as Jesus used the term referred not to himself but to the community he came to found. In the pericope Mk 10:35-45, the sons of Zebedee ask Jesus for special privilege in the kingdom of God. Jesus counters their request by asking if they are able to drink the same cup and be baptized with the same martyr's death as he, Jesus. Only then "has it been prepared" for some to sit with Jesus in the glory which will follow the suffering. But for now, Jesus' disciples must not act like Gentiles,

"but whoever wishes to be great among you should be your servant, and whoever wishes to be first among you should be slave of all. For (καὶ γάρ) the Son of Man came not to be served (as Dn 7 says) but to serve and to give his life as a ransom for the many." (10:43-45)

Read without any preconceptions, the second sentence seems to function as the objective scriptural ground for the ethical injunction in the first sentence. The scriptural ground referred to is Dn 7 understood in the light of the martyr theology of the time, with no reference to Is 53 at all,¹ and in the light of this theology even the

¹ That this represents a reinterpretation of the Son of Man of Dn 7 and

ransom phrase refers to a group and not necessarily to an individual. Such an exposition is predicated on the assumption that a genuine saying of Jesus has been accurately transmitted, where Mark has been able to express his own understanding without any verbal alteration. The understanding of the church is clearly individual, as is shown by the parallel version in Proto-Luke, Lk 22:25-27, where the final argument is: "for. . . I am among you as one who serves." Mark too must have assumed an unexpressed minor premise: you should be servants, for I am a servant, and (unexpressed) "a servant is not greater than his master, nor is he who is sent greater than he who sent him" (Jn 13:16). Mark is able to express this individual interpretation simply by having the saying follow the third, most explicit anticipation of the passion story, but at the same time he is conscious of the original collective interpretation and by leaving the saying unaltered is able to express both at the same time.

In a very perceptive article ¹ T. W. Manson says that Mk 10:45 is the messianic secret, and it is an open secret. The reason Mark says the disciples did not understand is that no one could understand before the Holy Spirit was given (cf. Lk 10:21-24; Mt 16:17; 1 Cor 2:6-9), because no one wanted to understand. The messianic secret is not primarily about Jesus but about the believer who must accept for himself the necessity of suffering as a ransom for the many. This leads us to ask whether the collective concept of the Son of Man might not be found in another messianic secret context. The discussion after the transfiguration (Mk 9:9-13) is very important with respect to the messianic secret, even though as a composition of the evangelist it does not yield so readily a pre-Markan understanding. Jesus says that the disciples should not tell what they had seen "until the Son of Man should have risen from the dead." It is clear that they were not questioning what the concept itself meant, but only why, after the general resurrection,² there should be any need to tell about the transfiguration at all. Mark says that the Son of Man rising from the dead is fulfilled in Jesus' resurrection, but in doing so he reflects his knowledge

not a reference to Is 53, cf. C. K. Barrett, "The Background of Mark 10:45," *New Testament Essays. Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson*, Manchester, 1959, pp. 1-18.

¹ "Realized Eschatology and the Messianic Secret."

² That this is what they would have understood, cf. Manson, "Realized Eschatology," p. 217f, cited below, p. 472.

of an earlier understanding (the disciples' questioning), in which the Son of Man rising from the dead refers to the general resurrection (Dn 12:2). Jesus replies to the question of Elijah coming before the final consummation by saying: 1. yes, Elijah does come first to restore all things according to Mal 3:23, and 2. the Son of Man must suffer many things according to Dn 7:19-25. Both of these have been fulfilled in that 1. Elijah has come, and 2. they did to him what they pleased (i.e. killed him) as is written of him. It is agreed that Mark is referring to John the Baptist, whose identification with Elijah seems to be an innovation of Markan theology in order to underline the eschatological significance of Jesus, but we must pay close attention to what is actually said about the Baptist. It is customary but illegitimate to say that the Markan text is obscure and then to read him in the light of Mt 17:9-13, where a clear distinction is made between two figures, Jesus as the Son of Man and John as Elijah. Mark however speaks only of one figure, and he applies to the death of John the Baptist a saying about the Son of Man. This is very significant in itself. If the tradition is older than Mark, it is conceivable that the Son of Man saying (without the Elijah reference) could very well have been a genuine saying of Jesus, in which he used the death of the Baptist as an object lesson for his disciples and their fate, in terms of the Son of Man.

We have now to deal with the so-called future sayings concerning the Son of Man. We have already seen that the statement at the trial

"From now on you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of Power and coming with the clouds of heaven." (14:62)

is an attempt by the church to express its understanding of Jesus' resurrection/ascension. It is significant here only insofar as it clearly is dependent on the suffering-exaltation pattern of Daniel, even if the reference is purely individual. The synoptic apocalypse

"Then they will see the Son of Man coming in clouds with great power and glory." (13:26)

does refer to the parousia, and this is a problem we shall discuss below. Mk 8:38 can perhaps best be dealt with in connection with the Proto-Lucan parallel Lk 12:8f:

Whoever is ashamed of me and mine
in this adulterous and sinful generation

He who denies me
before men

the Son of Man will be ashamed of him will be denied
 when he comes in the glory of his Father before the angels of God.
 with the holy angels.

(Mk 8:38)

I tell you, whoever confesses me
 before men

the Son of Man will confess
 before the angels of God.

(Lk 12:8f)

It is generally recognized that we have here two versions of one saying, in which the Lucan form is apt to be the more original. As we saw, the Lucan saying refers to the role of the exalted Son of Man as a witness not as a judge, exactly as in Dn 7:22, where "judgment is given for the saints of the Most High." The transition to the Markan saying, which seems to refer to the parousia, is an easy one, from the Son of Man coming *into* the glory of his Father (Dn 7:13) to the Son of Man coming *in* (= with) the glory of his Father. It is commonly assumed that Lk 12:8f represents an authentic saying of Jesus as it stands, and Tödt's thesis is built on the distinction Jesus makes in this saying between himself and the Son of Man. Both are dubious. The form of the saying agrees so well with the *Sätze heiligen Rechtes* which Käsemann has established as a form of prophetic sayings in the gospels, that it can hardly be denied that Lk 12:8f has been given its present form by early Christian prophets.¹ If this is true, then the modification of the saying in Mk 8:38 is also likely to be due to these prophets, a point which will be quite significant in our later discussion. It should be clear, however, that for the Christian prophets Jesus and the Son of Man were identical and that therefore no distinction between them was intended in their formulation of Lk 12:8f. It is possible that the alternation: "confesses me/the Son of Man will confess" is due only to the parallelism of this prophetic form. It is also possible that the formal distinction was preserved because in an earlier form of the saying a real distinction was intended. If so, a clue is provided by the Markan version as found in W k sa Tert (omitting λόγους). "Whoever is ashamed of us (me and mine), we (the Son of Man) will be ashamed of him." T. W. Manson² has argued that the original meaning of Mk 8:38 was thus in reference

¹ Cf. E. Käsemann, "Sätze heiligen Rechtes im Neuen Testament," *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*, II, Göttingen, 1964, pp. 69-82, p. 78.

² *Teaching*, pp. 263-270, 332-333.

to the Son of Man as a collective witness at the judgment, and he points to the judgment scene Mt 25:31-46 as a parallel. Here it seems that the Son of Man is distinguished not only from the Father but also from the King who carries out the judgment, Jesus. In any case the criterion for judgment is the treatment accorded the brethren of Jesus, who are thus cast in the role of witnesses for or against those being judged.¹ While not conclusive in itself, Manson's understanding provides one more link in a chain of cumulative arguments.

Perhaps the most important evidence for supposing that Jesus interpreted Dn 7:13f in a collective sense is provided by passages not containing the phrase Son of Man at all but nevertheless ultimately derived from this passage.² We are here not concerned with the suffering aspect at all, since Jesus' predictions of suffering for his followers is so well documented and there is no necessity of connecting this specifically with Daniel. However, if we find some of the exaltation aspects applied to Jesus' followers this is more unusual, and a connection with Daniel can perhaps be assumed. We shall therefore look for echoes of the passage where Daniel saw how "with the clouds of heaven there came one like a son of man, and he arrived at the Ancient of Days and was brought before him; and to him was given authority and glory and kingdom, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him. His authority is an everlasting authority, and his kingdom one which shall not be destroyed" (Dn 7:13-14). We shall look first for possible reflections of the authority, glory, and kingdom given the Son of Man, and, since as we have seen the transition from witness to judge is such an easy one, for statements concerning judgment. Finally, the detail of travelling to God on clouds is so specific that any reference to it would be most significant.

We have seen that Jesus' statement in Mt 28:18, "all authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me," is a quite conscious reference to Dn 7:13f. The same is true of Jn 6:27, "(the Father) gave him authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of Man." It is then possible that Daniel is also the basis for Jesus' giving his followers authority to forgive sin (Mk 2:10; Mt 16:19; 18:18; Jn 20:23), authority to cast out demons (Mk 3:15; 6:7;

¹ Cf. the impressive discussion of this passage in terms of "The Mystery of the Son of Man" in T. Preiss, *Life in Christ*, pp. 43-60.

² Cf. C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, London, 1952, pp. 67-70.

Lk 10:19) and to heal (Lk 9:1; Mt 10:1), authority to rule over the nations with a rod of iron (Rev 2:26f), and authority to become sons of God (Jn 1:12). The Son of Man is given glory in Dn 7, and the glory which God gives Jesus is given to his disciples in Jn 17:22. The inheritance of glory can really be connected with Dn 7 only when it appears in connection with suffering, as in Rm 8:18, "the sufferings of this present time" and "the glory which will be revealed to us," or in 1 Pet 1:11, "the sufferings unto Christ and the subsequent glories." The whole theme of tribulation-vindication is probably ultimately derived from what is said of the Son of Man.

Much more important because less general are those passages which speak of a kingdom which is given to Jesus' followers. Since the kingdom of God is connected with the verb "to give" only in Dn 7 in the pre-Christian literature, we have to assume a connection when Jesus says Lk 12:32, "fear not, little flock, for your Father has been pleased to give you the kingdom." The reference is even more explicit in Lk 22:28-30, "you are those who have endured with me in my tribulations. And I give (*διδωμι* with overtones of covenant) to you, as my Father gave to me, a kingdom, so that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and you shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (cf. Mt 19:28 for a parallel to the last phrase). The motifs of enduring tribulation, of being given a kingdom, of sitting on thrones, of judging, all are quite specifically connected with Dn 7. If the hymn 2 Tim 2:12 ("if we endure we shall also reign with him") and the irony of 1 Cor 4:8 ("would that you did reign") are more general, we find in the hymn Rev 5:9f again specific reference to the language of Daniel, when the seer speaks of those the Lamb has ransomed "from every tribe and language and nation and people, and thou (Jesus) hast made them a kingdom and priests for our God, and they shall rule as kings on the earth." That the Christians should be said to judge (cf. in addition to Lk 22:30; Mt 19:28 also 1 Cor 6:2, 4, "the saints (sic!) will judge the world. . . will judge angels") is unusual enough, but that they should do so from thrones points directly to Dn 7:9.¹ That the plural "thrones" are said in this verse to be brought for the judgment

¹ That the thrones are derived from Dn 7 cf. O. Schmitz, *TWNT*, III, 165. Also in Qumran it is the community which exercises judgment; that this is from Dn 7:27, cf. H. W. Huppenbauer, "Enderwartung und Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit im Habakuk-Kommentar," *TZ* 20 (1964), 81-86.

is known to have caused difficulty for the Rabbis (Hag 14a): R. Akiba explained: one for God and one for David; R. Jose the Galilean explained, one for justice and one for mercy; R. Eleazar b. Azariah explained, one for a chair and one for a footstool. The Christian solution seems to have assumed many thrones for the Son of Man. Lk 22:30; Mt 19:28 speak of twelve thrones, Rev. 20:4 speaks simply of "thrones, and seated on them were those to whom the judgment was committed," and Rev 3:21 seems to speak specifically of the martyrs, "He who conquers, I will grant him to sit with me on my throne, as I myself conquered and sat down with my Father on his throne." There is one final text in which the reference to the collective Son of Man is even more explicit.

Perhaps the most important passage for understanding the early Christian collective understanding of the Son of Man is 1 Thes 4:16-17, a passage rarely discussed in this connection. The most unusual trait in the description of Dn 7:13f, that which leads one to posit a dependence on Daniel wherever it appears, is the fact that the Son of Man ascends on clouds to come into the presence of God. It is then extremely significant that in the earliest parousia text it is the Christians and not the Lord who are said to travel on clouds, and that the direction of their motion is from the earth into the presence of the Lord. Along with J. Jeremias¹ and P. Nepper-Christensen² I take the "word of the Lord" which Paul cites to lie in verses 16-17a: "The Lord himself with a command, the voice of an archangel, and the divine trumpet will come down from heaven. And the dead will rise first, then the living will be caught up together with them on clouds into the air to escort the Lord."³ If this really does represent a saying of Jesus, then the Lord must be God, whose coming to earth at the end provides the Old Testament basis for the language used here.⁴ It is important to emphasize this

¹ *Unknown Sayings of Jesus*, London, 1958, pp. 64-67.

² "Das verborgene Herrnwort. Eine Untersuchung über 1. Thess. 4, 13-18," *Stud. Theol.* 19 (1965), 136-154.

³ The presumable Pauline additions have been omitted in this translation: the phrase ἐν Χριστῷ in Vs 16 and the words ἡμεῖς . . . οἱ περιλειπόμενοι in Vs 17, words which have clearly been introduced to adapt the saying to the context (cf. ἡμεῖς . . . οἱ περιλειπόμενοι in Vs 15). Over against Jeremias Nepper-Christensen would include also Vs 17c, "and thus we shall always be with the Lord," as part of the quoted saying.

⁴ Cf. Nepper-Christensen, p. 149, who points out this Old Testament background for the coming of God to earth but then inconsistently, p. 148, assumes that the "Lord" of the quotation is Jesus.

point, that either we have a more or less genuine saying of Jesus or the saying concerns the parousia of Jesus, for both cannot be true. Whoever the Lord is, however, the scenery is the same: the "Lord" descends from heaven to a point somewhere between heaven and earth and stops; he then gives a command through an archangel blowing a trumpet to summon the dead from their graves. These martyrs then join with the faithful living and in a group they ride on clouds to that point in the air where the Lord is, and then presumably they come with him back to the earth. This is an extraordinary picture, and there is nothing in Israelite eschatology to suggest anything like this strange ride. While ἀπάντησις may be a technical word to describe the procession of citizens going out to escort a visiting monarch into their city,¹ this explains the use of the word but hardly the origin of the conception. The only possible source for the conception of people riding on clouds to meet God in the air is Dn 7:13, and this passage compels us to the conclusion that Dn 7:13 was understood not only of an ascent but also collectively.² Whether or not the saying is a genuine word of Jesus, it is very probable that this early understanding of the Son of Man in a collective sense was also the understanding of Jesus.

It is always difficult to try to reconstruct the teaching of Jesus when this differed from that of the church. Insofar as we can do so, we conclude then that for Jesus the term Son of Man was a collective concept, referring to the community he had come to call into existence, the eschatological Israel, which would pass through suffering to vindication. Only in this way can the derivation of the phrase from Dn 7 be understood. Only in this way can the development of the concept in the later church be understood, in which the term became restricted to Jesus and finally to his parousia, but many traces of the earlier conception remained.

We must take very seriously the absolute centrality of the kingdom of God in the teaching of Jesus. This concept in itself excludes all Christology from his teaching.³ Vielhauer is then absolutely right in his insistence that an apocalyptic Son of Man can

¹ Cf. E. Peterson, *TWNT* I, 380, and his article there cited.

² The force of an old habit of thought directly counter to the text under consideration is shown by Jeremias' statement p. 66, "The Son of Man (Dn. 7.13) appears in the heavens, followed by more than twelve legions of angels . . . Then . . . Jesus gives the word, and an archangel sounds the last trump."

³ Cf. the very fruitful observations of K. G. Kuhn, *TWNT*, I, 570-573.

have no place in Jesus' teaching beside his proclamation of the kingdom of God. He has however not understood that the term is neither apocalyptic nor Christological and that it is very closely related to the kingdom of God. In fact the two are almost synonymous.¹ It is not true that the Son of Man and the kingdom of God are never associated in the synoptic tradition, as not only a comparison of Mt 16:27 with Mk 9:1 shows,² but also the alternation of Lk 9:58 and 62; Mt 10:7 and 23; Mt 11:11 and 19; Mt 20:21 and 28. That they never occur together in the same sentence is because the Son of Man does not have a kingdom, he is the kingdom. Although still subject to some old Life-of-Jesus limitations, the correct way to understand the relation of the two was indicated by T. W. Manson. As H. Ridderbos put it, " 'Kingdom of God' and 'the Son of Man' are correlates in Jesus' preaching. . . . (This) proves that to a great extent Jesus' preaching is orientated to the prophecy in Daniel 7:13ff." ³ It is Dn 7:22 which is behind the summary statement of Jesus Mk 1:15, "The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God has come near." ⁴ Such considerations lead us into a brief discussion of the teaching of Jesus as a whole.

B. *The Kingdom of God as Promise and Crisis*

It is perhaps incumbent on us at this point to attempt to show how the various concepts we have so far discussed fit together. We have suggested that new temple and kingdom of God were somehow equivalent concepts. Again we have suggested that Son of Man and kingdom of God were almost synonymous expressions in the teaching of Jesus. We have yet to deal with the issue of what these three, kingdom of God, Son of Man, and new temple, have to do with the church. Furthermore, we have noted the very strong

¹ Singularly unhelpful because of his use of inappropriate religions-geschichtliche backgrounds is the book which had the relationship of these two terms as its subject matter, R. Otto, *Kingdom of God and Son of Man*.

² H. H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, London, 1963³, p. 137, says concerning the juxtaposition of Mk 9:1 and 8:38, "Mark has perceived that the Son of Man here meant the kingdom of God. So, too, in the passage in the Little Apocalypse, which speaks of the coming of the Son of Man in clouds with great power and glory, it is probable that the Son of Man is primarily a symbol for the coming kingdom in its consummation."

³ *The Coming of the Kingdom*, Philadelphia, 1962, pp. 31f; cf. also J. Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*, Assen, 1954, pp. 119-161.

⁴ Cf. C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures; The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology*, London, 1952, p. 69.

eschatological component of these expressions. At the same time, we analysed the political aspects of the gospel in Proto-Luke and suggested that these too go back to Jesus. There is then the very great problem of how this political preaching and eschatological expectation can both be presupposed in the same teaching. Insofar as we enter even very briefly into these questions, we shall be participating in the new quest for the historical Jesus.

First of all we can agree with the new questers that Jesus taught no Christology and made no explicit messianic claim for himself at all.¹ He came to proclaim the kingdom of God, not to claim the kingship for himself. Characteristic of Jesus' preaching is not the "I am. . ." of John but the "I came. . ." of the synoptics, for Jesus spoke not of his person but of his message and mission. Those titles which probably were used by Jesus, such as Son of Man and Son of God, refer not exclusively to himself but rather to the community Israel should have been and which he came to create; as applied to Jesus they refer to him as the representative of the true Israel, and as the "pioneer of our faith" (Heb 12:2), the "first-born among many brethren" (Rm 8:29). Jesus proclaimed the coming of the kingdom of God, and the church saw the kingdom come in Jesus, for he in his own person was the embodiment of the message he came to proclaim. Jesus came to build the eschatological temple, the community where the presence of God is manifested and the sins of the world atoned, and the church sees the fulfillment in her head, in Jesus himself. Jesus came to tend the vineyard of Israel, and the church sees in him the true vine, in themselves but branches. We are invited to see in Jesus the Lord, the Son of God, the Christ, not because of his "messianic consciousness" but because the New Testament proclaims these titles as the only adequate response of faith to the whole person and message of Jesus. The impression

¹ Very important in this respect is the pioneering essay of E. Käsemann, "Das Problem des historischen Jesus," *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*, I, Göttingen, 1960², pp. 187-214, "Wenn es sich jedoch wirklich so verhält und Jesus nie ausdrücklich Anspruch auf Messianität erhoben hat, so wäre das ausserordentlich charakteristisch" (p. 211). At the same time he introduced the concept of an indirect Christology: "Wer Autorität neben und gegen Moses beansprucht, hat sich faktisch über Moses gestellt und aufgehört, ein Rabbi zu sein . . . Vor allem kommt keinem Propheten die eschatologische Bedeutung zu, die Jesus offensichtlich seinem Tun beigemessen hat" (pp. 206, 210); cf. G. Bornkamm, *Jesus von Nazareth*, Stuttgart, 1956, pp. 155-163; E. Fuchs, *Studies of the Historical Jesus*, London, 1964, almost passim; J. Knox, *The Death of Christ*, London, 1959, pp. 52-77.

Jesus made on his contemporaries was that of a prophet, even the prophet. Nevertheless, implicitly, more than a prophet was here (Mt 12:41). The coming kingdom was already manifested in Jesus' words and actions (Lk 11:26); he asked people to follow him even unto death (Mk 8:34); the fate of people in the judgment would depend on the attitude taken to Jesus (Lk 12:8f); the new age beginning with Jesus was declared qualitatively different from the old (Mt 11:11ff); Jesus could act with God's prerogatives in declaring the forgiveness of sins (Mk 2:5) and in acting as Lord of the Sabbath (Mk 2:28; Jn 5:17)—all of this authority can be summed up in the characteristic phrase of Jesus, "Amen, amen, I say to you. . ." Jesus astonishes by his freedom, in eating with sinners (which he justifies by referring to the mercy of God! Lk 15), in touching the unclean, in not being bound by the conventionally pious, in interpreting the Old Testament. In Jesus' whole life, in the freedom and authority implicit in all his words and actions, lies the eschatological event to which the New Testament is but a response. Here is the reality of which the Christology of the New Testament seeks to be an adequate interpretation.

On the other hand we must disagree with the new questers when it comes to the point of defining the point of continuity between the teaching of Jesus and the kerygma of the church. In a very interesting essay on the Christology of Paul and John and the synoptic gospels, H. Braun¹ concludes that what they have in common with one another and with the preaching of Jesus is not Christology but an understanding of human existence before God. The continuity of the New Testament lies then not in its Christology but in its anthropology. It may or may not be appropriate to interpret the New Testament for the twentieth century in an existentialist framework, but this question of application must be kept rigorously distinct from the historical question. With respect to the first century, no matter how broadly interpreted, the word "anthropology" seems to be an anachronism. While we could agree then with Braun on the variability of Christology, we would have to define the constancy in terms of ecclesiology.

Even here there is discontinuity in the midst of continuity. If our exposition above has been correct, then there has been at least a partial shift in application of the concepts we discussed from ec-

¹ "Der Sinn der neutestamentlichen Christologie," *Gesammelte Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt*, Tübingen, 1962, pp. 243-282.

clesiology to Christology. The new temple as the community in which the presence of God is actualized, although still a part of the teaching of the church as well as that of Jesus, comes finally to apply to Jesus himself in the doctrine of the Incarnation. The kingdom of God which Jesus proclaimed as coming into existence in the new community, although still a part of the teaching of the church, was seen to be ultimately fulfilled in Jesus the *αὐτοβασιλεία*. The Son of Man as the community which goes through suffering to vindication, although at least in part still the teaching of the church, was seen to have its most important fulfillment in Jesus' own death and resurrection. This development must not be seen as illegitimate but as due to the logic of events themselves. Whatever Jesus may have taught, the basic fact remains that on Easter he was raised from the dead and he was alone in his resurrection. Everything which Jesus taught was in fact fulfilled—in himself. The resurrection stands between the teaching of Jesus and the teaching of the church, and it is this which makes recovery of the former so difficult.

In speaking of Jesus' teaching concerning the future, it is customary to distinguish two sets of sayings, those referring to an imminent eschaton and those without this implication, including predictions of judgment for Israel and persecution for the disciples.¹ There seems to be a contradiction here which must be somehow resolved. One solution would be to understand the second set as predictions which could have been fulfilled in Jesus' lifetime, as do Schweitzer and Barrett.² More popular has been the elimination of the first set altogether by making the eschaton not only imminent but completely present in the lifetime of Jesus. This is the way C. H. Dodd interprets Mk 1:15 and 9:1.³ This is really to eliminate the temporal element from eschatology altogether as do, each in his own way, Dodd and Bultmann and Fuchs. But if the imminent sayings are shrinkable to the lifetime of Jesus, they are also stretchable to cover a whole generation after his death. This is the solution of W. G. Kümmel,⁴ that Jesus predicted a short series of events to take place after his death but also the final

¹ Cf. J. Jeremias, "Eine neue Schau der Zukunftsaussagen Jesu," *ThBl* 20 (1941), 216-222.

² A. Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus; A Critical Study of its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede*, New York, 1948; C. K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*, London, r.p. 1966.

³ *The Parables of the Kingdom*, London, 1935, pp. 44f, 53f.

⁴ *Promise and Fulfillment*, London, 1957.

coming of the eschaton within a very short time afterward. In comparison with Dodd and Bultmann, Kümmel has the very great advantage of retaining the temporal element, and his understanding approximates very closely that of the early church. With respect to the teaching of Jesus, however, Kümmel assumes that many sayings of the gospel tradition had not only the same wording but also the same significance when Jesus said them as in the transmission of the church. This is questionable. We shall suggest that of the two sets of sayings one is not to be subordinated to the other nor are they to be seen in a simple temporal succession but that they represent alternatives.

To take first the promise of the kingdom of God, it is possible to see Jesus' message summed up¹ in the words of Mk 1:14f, "Jesus came into Galilee proclaiming the gospel of God: 'The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God has come near; repent and believe in the gospel.' " The reference to the fullness of time points rather decisively toward an Old Testament prophecy whose fulfillment is now being proclaimed. The content of this prophecy is the imminent kingdom of God, which in Dn 7 is equivalent to the vindication and exaltation of the Son of Man. Already Daniel is an actualization of an earlier prophecy, Deutero-Isaiah, and this seems to be the ultimate reference also in the proclamation of Jesus. We can compare the "gospel" passage in Is 52:7-10,

How beautiful upon the mountains
are the feet of him who brings good tidings,
who publishes peace, who brings good tidings of good, who publishes salvation,
who says to Zion, "Your God reigns."
Hark, your watchmen lift up their voice,
together they sing for joy;
for eye to eye they see
the return of Yahweh to Zion.
Break forth together into singing,
you waste places of Jerusalem;
for Yahweh has comforted his people,

¹ Note how this corresponds point for point with the kerygma of the early church as outlined by C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*, London, 1956f, p. 17. "The time is fulfilled" corresponds to "The prophecies are fulfilled and the new Age is inaugurated by the coming of Christ", while the death, resurrection, and exaltation of Jesus in the kerygma correspond in essence to what Jesus said about the kingdom of God. Both statements conclude with an exhortation to repentance and faith.

he has redeemed Jerusalem.
 Yahweh has bared his holy arm
 before the eyes of all the nations;
 and all the ends of the earth shall see
 the salvation of our God.

Jesus' message can perhaps best be understood as the announcement that now, in his time, the prophecy of Deutero-Isaiah was being fulfilled, i.e. the eschatological Israel as the kingdom of God and the new Zion, including the redemption of Jerusalem but also salvation for the nations. The eschatological component is then essential if Jesus announces that now the prophecy is being fulfilled for this generation, but Deutero-Isaiah certainly does not imply the coming of the kingdom "in a moment, in the winking of an eye" (1 Cor 15:52). One can even speak of the coming of salvation in Deutero-Isaiah as a process: already the prophet hears the angels going forth (Is 40:3-5) to prepare the way for the procession back to Jerusalem, but this will take some time. In the parables of growth the kingdom is somehow already present in Jesus' followers, and the consummation will follow soon. Neither Deutero-Isaiah nor Jesus is apocalyptic in the sense of setting an exact date for an instantaneous transformation, but both are eschatological in announcing the final consummation of history during the lifetime of their own generation. One cannot eliminate the near expectation from Jesus' message and still call it eschatology.

Some years ago A. Schweitzer proposed that Jesus did not distinguish between his resurrection and parousia.¹ This important question has unfortunately never been given the attention it deserved because criticism of Schweitzer has tended to focus on his much more questionable assertion on the basis of Mt 10:23 that Jesus expected an apocalyptic kingdom to come during his lifetime. As against a liberal theology which made the kingdom of God into an achievement of man, Weiss and Schweitzer were right to emphasize that it is a gift of God, but they over-emphasized the apocalyptic component. It seems to me, however, that Schweitzer's statement concerning a distinction between

¹ "He (Jesus) means by that (his resurrection), not a single isolated act, but a complex occurrence consisting of His metamorphosis, translation to heaven, and Parousia as the Son of Man. And with this is associated the general eschatological resurrection of the dead. It is, therefore, one and the same thing whether He speaks of His resurrection or of His coming on the clouds of heaven," Schweitzer, *Quest*, p. 366.

resurrection and parousia must be accepted. While a man may speak of something happening after his death, it is hard to imagine how he could go on to speak of a second act happening after that, and in fact we never find resurrection and parousia combined in a single saying. This means that Kümmel's whole reconstruction, insofar as it refers to the teaching of Jesus, breaks down.

We have had occasion to notice the strange parallel between Mk 14:58, the building of the new temple "in three days", and the anticipations of the passion which say that the Son of Man will rise "after three days". Neither of these is an *ex eventu* formulation based on Jesus' resurrection, for here the more usual "on the third day" would be more appropriate. If this statement is properly precise, the others are more general, saying that something will happen not at a certain time but within a certain period, either within three days or shortly after three days have passed. Both phrases mean simply "within a short time" without any attempt to be precise in dating it (cf. ἔτι μικρόν Jn 14:19; 16:16). As Black says concerning the similar usage in Lk 13:32, "No two definite days followed by a third day are implied, but a short indefinite period, followed by a still indefinite but imminent and certain future event. . . . The idiom is a common Semitic one, and examples in Aramaic are frequent."¹ The sayings then cannot refer to some apocalyptic event exactly three days after Jesus' death. In the first place neither refers to the death of Jesus, as we have seen, and so there is no starting terminus from which to begin counting. The sayings refer to the present suffering of Jesus and his followers, to be followed in a short time by the vindication of the Son of Man, the building of the new temple. There may very well be a connection with Hos 6:2, "After two days he will revive us, on the third day he will raise us up, that we may live before him." It is important to notice that the reference here is not to the resurrection of an individual but to the restoration of a community. This is not the sort of thing which happens instantaneously even if it can occur soon and in a relatively short time. There can be no question of a setting of dates in Jesus' proclamation, particularly if Mk 13:32 is genuine: "Concerning that day or that hour no one knows, neither the angels in heaven nor the Son, but only the Father." As soon

¹ M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, Oxford, 1954f, p. 152.

as we realize that the teaching of Jesus refers to a community and not to himself, then the apocalyptic element is greatly reduced. At the same time we must not eliminate the eschatological entirely, and especially must not try to interpret the expectation of Jesus in terms of what actually resulted in the church. Altogether it is best to understand his expectation before the fact in as vague a manner as possible. Dahl has summed it up very well in emphasizing both the temporal uncertainty of a nevertheless eschatological expectation and the communal aspect of Jesus' expectation: "Jesus hat seine Auferweckung und seine Parousie, das Kommen des Reiches Gottes und die Bildung der neuen Gemeinde in eins gesehen."¹

We have now to raise the question of the relationship between Jesus' expectation and the church which resulted. The well known ironic statement of Loisy is relevant here: "Jésus a annoncé le royaume de Dieu, et c'est l'église qui est venue."² While in fact the church may be a partial and proleptic fulfillment of Jesus' expectation of the kingdom of God, the two must not be confused nor may one assume that Jesus expected anything like what the church (minus Israel!) became. It is this which justifies the objections which have been expressed against the genuineness of Mt 16:17-19. If this passage is taken to refer to a "Sonder-כנישתא"³ or to a remnant within Israel,⁴ then it is quite right to argue that it cannot have been said by Jesus.⁵ But as we have seen, this is

¹ N. A. Dahl, *Das Volk Gottes; Eine Untersuchung zum Kirchenbewusstsein des Urchristentums*, Oslo, 1941, p. 166; cf. Jeremias, "Neue Schau".

² A. Loisy, *L'Evangile et l'Eglise*, Paris, 1902, p. 111, cited in O. Cullmann, *Petrus, Jünger-Apostel-Märtyrer*, Zürich, 1952, p. 183.

³ K. L. Schmidt, *TWNT*, III, 529f.

⁴ F. Kattenbusch (p. 418 n. 2), p. 163; G. Gloege, *Reich Gottes und Kirche im Neuen Testament*, Gütersloh, 1929, pp. 241-247; R. N. Flew, *Jesus and His Church*, London, 1938, pp. 48-58, 124f; T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, Cambridge, 1963, pp. 175-178, 227ff.

⁵ Cf. the trenchant criticisms of R. Bultmann, "Die Frage nach der Echtheit von Mt 16, 17-19," *ThBl* 20 (1941), 265-279, Sp 269; W. G. Kümmel, "Jesus und die Anfänge der Kirche," *Stud. Theol.* 7 (1953), 1-27; J. Jeremias, "Der Gedanke des 'Heiligen Restes' im Spätjudentum und in der Verkündigung Jesu," *ZNW* 42 (1949), 184-194; A. Oepke, *Das neue Gottesvolk*, Gütersloh, 1950, pp. 165f; Dahl, *Volk Gottes*, pp. 160ff. The latter remarks, p. 161, "Die Gemeinschaft der Jesus-Jünger hat innerhalb des Judentums etwas Befremdliches an sich, eine Sondersynagoge ohne Synagoge und ohne Halacha! ein apokalyptischer Kreis ohne Apokalyptik! eine messianische Bewegung ohne Zelotismus! (ein Jüngerkreis wie der des Täufers ohne Taufe!)."

not the best interpretation of the passage, which seems to refer rather to the eschatological people of God.¹ To speak of the church as a separate community apart from Israel is an anachronism for most of the New Testament, to say nothing of the teaching of Jesus.

In speaking of the new temple and the Son of Man and the kingdom of God, Jesus is referring to the eschatological Israel, but this means not a remnant as in Qumran but all Israel. The very existence of the Twelve representing the twelve tribes of Israel (Mt 19:28; Lk 22:30), and especially of one of the Twelve named Rock (Mt 16:17), shows that the new community Jesus intended is Israel and all Israel. The historicity of the calling of the Twelve during Jesus' lifetime has sometimes been doubted, but the very fact that the various lists in the gospels do not completely agree is a sign of the institution of the Twelve not by the church but by Jesus. The Twelve cannot be considered a remnant, because a remnant is the end result of a process of reduction from all Israel to these few, and the Twelve represent for Jesus rather the beginning of an expansion to the eschatological Israel, the kingdom of God. Jesus certainly does not speak of the church as we know it but of the kingdom of God, but as we have seen the kingdom of God in his thought represents a realm of salvation, a community.

Jesus' whole proclamation is centered around his mission, which was not only to announce but to build the kingdom of God. This new temple, new community would be the eschatological Israel, and as such would include also the Gentiles. The actual community which existed in Jesus' lifetime in the group of his disciples was meant not as the nucleus of a separate community called the church but the anticipation and beginning of the eschatological Israel. This is the whole point of the parables of growth, the contrast between the small group of disciples and the final kingdom of God, but also the intimate relation between them and the call to believe in this relationship and not to be discouraged.² Jesus came

¹ Cf. especially A. Oepke, "Der Herrnspruch über die Kirche Mt 16, 17-19 in der neuesten Forschung," *Stud. Theol.* 2 (1950), 110-165. Kümmel, "Jesus und die Anfänge," p. 16, objects, "Wenn man, wie Oepke, mit Recht bestreitet, dass Jesus an einer 'Sondersynagoge' gedacht habe, kann man nicht zu gleicher Zeit annehmen, dass er für die Zeit zwischen Auferstehung und Parousie ein vom alten Gottesvolk klar geschiedenes neues Gottesvolk ins Auge gefasst habe." Why not?

² Cf. N. A. Dahl, "The Parables of Growth," *Stud. Theol.* 5 (1951), 132-166.

to call all Israel and all men into the kingdom of God, and he also called certain men into fellowship with himself. Because of the relationship between the two, discipleship in the gospels means something much more than being just students of a Rabbi or even disciples of a prophet (Is 8:18). Kingdom of God and discipleship are correlate concepts. Manson has pointed out in parallel tables¹ how the specific requirements for entry into the kingdom of God are exactly equivalent to the requirements for becoming a disciple of Jesus: complete self-sacrifice, obedience, and loyalty. The most appropriate entrée into the teaching of Jesus concerning the future would be not through the apocalyptic sayings of the gospels but those concerning discipleship. Discipleship should then be added to our correlation of new temple—kingdom of God—Son of Man.

That the concept Son of Man is related to our discussion was maintained by F. Kattenbusch, who called Dn 7 the "Quellort der Kirchenidee."² The Son of Man represents the whole people of Israel who are called upon to "dienen, lieben, leiden."³ Not just Jesus, not the church, but all Israel is called to be "the salt of the earth,"⁴ "the light of the world,"⁵ and "the city set on a hill"⁶ (Mt 5:13f). It is unfortunate that Kattenbusch went on to connect the Son of Man not with the kingdom of God but with the foundation of the church as a "Sonder-k'nischta."⁷ The act of "Kirchen-gründung"⁸ he takes to be the last supper. For this to be true the most basic element of the Lord's Supper would have to be the command, "Do this in remembrance of me" (1 Cor 11:24, 25). In fact the primary saying seems to be the expectation of Jesus of drinking wine anew in the kingdom of God (Mk 14:25), to which even the concepts of his death "for" us and the covenants of Jer 31 and Ex 24 are later additions.⁹ Thus here again we are led to

¹ T. W. Manson, *Teaching*, p. 205.

² F. Kattenbusch, "Der Quellort der Kirchenidee," *Festgabe A. von Harnack zum 70. Geburtstag*, Tübingen, 1921, pp. 143-172.

³ Kattenbusch, p. 163.

⁴ Cf. J. B. Souček, "Salz der Erde und Licht der Welt. Zur Exegese von Matth. 5, 13-16," *TZ* 19 (1963), 169-179, who points out the sacrificial and even atoning connotations.

⁵ The task of Israel, cf. Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, I, ad Mt 5: 14, and C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge, 1953, pp. 204ff.

⁶ Cf. G. von Rad, "Die Stadt auf dem Berge," *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, München, 1958, pp. 214-224.

⁷ Kattenbusch, p. 164.

⁸ Kattenbusch, p. 169.

⁹ Cf. T. A. Burkill, *Mysterious Revelation*, Ithaca, 1963, pp. 258-279;

see not a separated church but the kingdom of God which would include all Israel. It is not the church but Israel, the saints of the Most High, who are called on as the Son of Man to undergo tribulation and enter the kingdom of God.

The expectation of Jesus is completely eschatological but not at all apocalyptic. "Die Dinge liegen doch wohl so, dass Jesus zwar von der apokalyptisch bestimmten Täuferbotschaft ausging, seine eigene Predigt aber nicht konstitutiv durch die Apokalyptik geprägt war, sondern die Unmittelbarkeit des nahen Gottes verkündigte. . . . Offensichtlich redet Jesus vom Kommen der Basileia in einem anderen Sinne als der Täufer und das zeitgenössische Judentum, nämlich nicht ausschliesslich oder auch nur primär auf ein chronologisch zu datierendes Weltende bezogen."¹ Unlike the day of Yahweh, the day of resurrection and judgment, the kingdom of God is not something that comes in an instant, the twinkling of an eye. Nevertheless it is an eminently eschatological conception. Insofar as Jesus announces the fulfillment of the prophecies of Deutero-Isaiah, it takes some time for them to happen, but nevertheless they do happen in a relatively short time. Insofar as his message is good news, by its very nature it must be good news to the present generation. There is no time fixed at all but still the kingdom of God which begins in the circle of Jesus' followers will extend to all Israel and the nations (Dn 7:14; Is 45:23) within a generation. It is not easy to try to imagine from the gospels which presuppose a different situation what the expectation of Jesus during his lifetime was, but it might have been something similar to this.

If we turn now to the realization of Jesus' expectation we find that everything he announced came true—in himself. This had not been expected. No wonder the disciples were shocked and confused at Jesus' death and incredulous about his resurrection. Indeed it is perhaps possible to say that the most surprised person on Easter morning was Jesus himself. He had expected the suffering and

E. Schweizer, "Abendmahl I. Im NT," *RGG*, I, Tübingen, 1957³. The "for" concept was added by Paul to the bread saying, by Mark to the cup saying; Paul seems to refer to the covenant of Jer 31 and Mark to that of Ex 24. Important as these concepts are, they are then not original.

¹ E. Käsemann, "Die Anfänge christlicher Theologie" and "Zum Thema der urchristlichen Apokalyptik," *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*, II, Göttingen, 1964, pp. 82-104 and 105-131, pp. 99, 109; cf. E. Fuchs, *Historical Jesus*, pp. 122, 182.

triumph of the Son of Man, but not only had he died alone but he was also alone in his resurrection. In his discussion of the prediction that the Son of Man would rise from the dead, Mk 9:9f, T. W. Manson puts it this way: "We may ask ourselves what the mention of resurrection would be likely to suggest to Palestinian Jews *before the first Easter Sunday*. Surely the first thing that would spring to mind would be. . . Dn 12:1-3. . . Hos 6:1-3. . . Ezek 37. . . a community that is brought back to life. In this connection it is relevant that Professor Martin Buber maintains that the normal way for the Jew to think of the resurrection was as the resurrection of a great community as a whole."¹ This was the first great crisis to which the church had to adjust. Since what Jesus had said about the community was in fact fulfilled in him as an individual, we get the beginning of the transition from ecclesiology to Christology. At the same time there is a partial and proleptic fulfillment of Jesus' expectation of the kingdom of God within the church. A new situation had arisen. Pentecost could not have been anticipated—but it happened. Barrett would answer the question of why the Holy Spirit occupies such a small place in the teaching of Jesus in this way: "He (Jesus) did not prophesy the existence of a Spirit-filled community, because he did not foresee an interval between the period of humiliation and that of complete and final glorification. He did not distinguish between his resurrection and parousia, and accordingly there was no room for the intermediate event, Pentecost."²

The new event, the death and resurrection of Jesus alone and the gift of the Holy Spirit, does not necessarily mean a change in the expectation of the final triumph in one generation. Indeed it seems all the more assured because of the evidence of the triumph of Jesus. Accordingly the preaching of Jesus to Israel and the expectation of Jesus of the impending triumph of Israel as the Son of Man and kingdom of God was continued by the church with all the more fervor. It was now necessary to speak of two comings of Jesus, in the flesh and in the Spirit, first as the prophet like Moses and now as the prophet like Joshua, but nevertheless the second

¹ "Realized Eschatology and the Messianic Secret," *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, Oxford, 1955, pp. 209-222, pp. 217f; cf. his "The New Testament Basis of the Doctrine of the Church," *JEH* 1 (1950), 1-11, p. 6.

² *Holy Spirit*, p. 160.

period was not expected to be any longer than the first. Even though certain adjustments in thinking were necessary, the first generation of the church was able to continue Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God in joyous expectation that it would be fulfilled in their generation.

We turn now to other aspects of Jesus' future expectation and can begin with the predictions of persecution for his followers. These sayings are not only not incompatible with the expectation of the kingdom of God as we have outlined it above but they are positively presupposed by it. The vindication of the Son of Man comes after the suffering of the Son of Man, and it is through many tribulations that we must enter the kingdom of God. It is then very significant that the Markan predictions of suffering come in the context of the anticipations of the passion of the Son of Man (Mk 8:34-38; 10:39f) of or the triumph of the Son of Man (Mk 13:11-13). The Q predictions are not dissimilar (Lk 6:22f = Mt 5:10-12; Lk 12:4-12 = Mt 10:28-33; Lk 14:26f = Mt 10:37f). While such sayings have plainly been modified in the course of their transmission, there is no reason whatever to deny that they represent in substance genuine teachings of Jesus. This is especially true when we see that some of the predictions were in fact unfulfilled (martyrdom of John with James, Mk 10:39). There is nothing in the predictions themselves which would preclude a setting within the lifetime of Jesus, and there is nothing in Jesus' expectation which would preclude the suffering of his disciples following a short time after his own death. There is then no contradiction between these predictions and Jesus' expectation of the triumph of the Son of Man, the building of the new temple, the final coming of the kingdom of God.

It is sometimes said that there is a tension between Jesus' ethical teaching and his eschatology, but this is not true if we do not understand the latter in apocalyptic terms. While the designation "interim ethic" ¹ is most inappropriate and eschatology is for Jesus hardly so peripheral as to function as a mere supernatural sanction for his more important ethical teaching,² this teaching as an ethic of the kingdom is an important aspect of his eschatological expectations.³

¹ A. Schweitzer, *Quest*, pp. 354ff.

² A. N. Wilder, *Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus*, New York, 1950².

³ Cf. Bornkamm, *Jesus von Nazareth*, pp. 88-132.

Here again, since there is no real issue, we can pass to a more crucial set of sayings.

It would seem to be impossible to reconcile Jesus' expectation of the kingdom of God for Israel in the near future with his predictions of historical catastrophe for the nation. In apocalyptic, history and the age to come are seen to be completely opposed to each other, so that history and the supra-historical could not exist side by side.¹ It seems then to be impossible for Jesus to have included both political and eschatological elements in his preaching, for this would mean to promise at once both judgment and salvation. It will not do to attempt to include the political judgments among the sufferings of the Son of Man and to ascribe them to different times, first the judgment and then the promise, because these judgments are not preliminary but final. They too are eschatologically oriented in that the threat is of final judgment. It would not do to divide them in such a way that they apply to different groups, salvation for the church and judgment for Israel, because all of Israel is addressed in Jesus' proclamation, with respect to both promise and threat. This is a dilemma which is today often resolved by assuming that the political element does not exist.² It is for us a very serious dilemma, for it means a direct confrontation between what was developed in Chapter III and what was developed in Chapter IV. It seems to be a direct contradiction to try to maintain the authenticity as a saying of Jesus of both the promise, "In three days I will build a new temple," and the threat, "They will not leave stone on stone that will not be thrown down."

We would however now like to maintain explicitly what was only

¹ It could be questioned whether even apocalyptic is really so anti-historical as is maintained in the handbooks. D. Rössler, *Gesetz und Geschichte; Untersuchungen zur Theologie der jüdischen Apokalypik und der pharisäischen Orthodoxie*, Neukirchen, 1960, raises some very important questions in this regard, even if it cannot be said that he has yet given them very satisfactory answers. Cf. the interesting thesis of R. M. Grant, *Gnosticism and Early Christianity*, New York, 1959, that disappointment over the never occurring end finally led apocalyptic into the truly anti-historical thought world of Gnosticism.

² W. G. Kümmel has maintained this position quite consistently. Cf. already his *Die Eschatologie der Evangelien; Ihre Geschichte und ihr Sinn*, Leipzig, 1936, p. 8, "Jesus verbindet keinerlei nationale Hoffnungen mit der Gottesherrschaft." With respect to the Lucan predictions of the fall of Jerusalem he says, *Promise and Fulfillment*, p. 103, n. 48, "As Jesus foretold the destruction of Jerusalem as a strictly eschatological event, it is in any case impossible that these Lucan predictions go back to Jesus."

suggested before, that the political preaching of Proto-Luke to Israel is a faithful continuation of the preaching of Jesus. Ever since J. Weiss demonstrated the importance of eschatology (in an apocalyptic sense) in the teaching of Jesus, this political aspect has been in the background. In the Anglo-Saxon world interest in it has been dropped because it was so closely associated with the social gospel movement and a non-eschatological, non-Christological biography of Jesus. As for Germany, "Eisler's bizarre attempt to turn Jesus into a half-hearted Zealot leader. . . confirmed rather than challenged the current neglect of the study of the political relations of the ministry of Jesus."¹ And yet this neglect is not justified, and we can still learn much from those writers² who have dealt with the subject, without falling as many of them did into "the peril of modernizing Jesus."³ There have recently been signs that this neglected aspect of the teaching of Jesus is beginning to be taken seriously once more.⁴

To speak generally of the political situation of first century Israel, it is incredible to think that Jesus had nothing to say about it at all.⁵ To be sure, there is very little of this nature in the gospels, but

¹ H. G. Wood, "Interpreting This Time," *NTS* 2 (1955-56), 262-266, p. 262.

² H. B. Sharman, *The Teaching of Jesus about the Future according to the Synoptic Gospels*, Chicago, 1909; S. Liberty, *The Political Relations of Christ's Ministry*, Oxford, 1916; J. R. Coates, *The Christ of Revolution*, London, 1920; V. G. Simkhovitch, *Toward the Understanding of Jesus*, New York, 1921, pp. 1-83; S. Dickey, *The Constructive Revolution of Jesus*, New York, n.d. (1923); J. Pickl, *Messiaskönig Jesus in der Auffassung seiner Zeitgenossen*, München, 1935²; and especially C. J. Cadoux, *The Historic Mission of Jesus*, London, 1941.

³ This is the title of a salutary corrective book by H. J. Cadbury, New York, 1937, r.p. London, 1962.

⁴ Cf. the plea by Wood, "Interpreting This Time" and the cautious attempts at a constructive statement by O. Cullmann, *Der Staat im Neuen Testament*, Tübingen, 1956, and P. Winter, *On the Trial of Jesus*, Berlin, 1961, pp. 136-148. Cf. also O. Betz, "Jesu Heiliger Krieg," *NT* 2 (1957), 208-223; and H. Montefiore, "Revolt in the Desert? (Mark vi. 30ff)," *NTS* 8 (1962), 135-141.

⁵ "Now it is idle to suppose that any person, Messiah or other, who felt charged with a mission to contemporary Israel, a mission to be wrought out on earth, could have blandly ignored this terrible obsession with which the mind of virtually the whole nation in Palestine was seething. To come forward as a national leader, to call as such for national acceptance and obedience, and yet to have no word to say or course to suggest with regard to the biggest practical problem with which the nation was agog, would surely have meant such trifling as we could not, without the strongest evidence, reasonably ascribe to any serious prophet, least of all to such a prophet as Jesus," Cadoux, *Historic Mission*, p. 168.

that is because they were written largely for Gentiles outside Palestine, for whom what Jesus had to say to the political situation of his own generation was relatively irrelevant.¹ This is the great importance of the Proto-Luke hypothesis, because the proclamation which underlies this gospel would have been directed to the same people in the same situation to which Jesus preached. The relation of once free Israel to the Roman occupying power must have been for the first century not only the burning problem of the time but also an almost daily practical issue. It would be a great mistake to imagine Jesus to have been either a withdrawn apocalyptic fanatic or a disinterested teacher of timeless Platonic or existential truths. "Rather was Jesus a true son of Israel who wrestled with and agonized over the crucial political, economic, social, and religious issues of his own particular people in his own particular day."² For the actual content of Jesus' preaching we can refer to our previous discussion of Proto-Luke. In that this gospel, and presumably Jesus, refer to a period of crisis, the threatened judgment does not exclude but includes political and even military elements. Judgment by God and political catastrophe are no more opposites for Jesus than they were for the Old Testament prophets. The national aspect of the parables of crisis has of course been muted in favor of the individual judgmental aspect, but the original scope in the situation of Jesus of these calls to repentance in the face of crisis can be recovered, as Dodd and Jeremias have shown. If there is a crisis then there is also a threat, and this threat is both political and ultimate. If Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai³ and Josephus⁴ and Jesus ben Hananiah⁵ could threaten the destruction of Jerusalem, there is no reason why Jesus could not also have done so. Thus there is no reason why Mk 13:2 should not be con-

¹ J. R. Coates, *Christ of Revolution*, opens his book with the blunt statement: "Jesus was interested in politics" (p. 9). That this interest has been obscured by the sources is because the attitude of the early church, except for Proto-Luke, corresponded to that of Tertullian: "No interest concerns us so little as that of the state" (Apology 38).

² W. R. Farmer, *Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus: An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period*, New York, 1956, p. 188. This book has been of value in emphasizing the importance of nationalism in first century Israel as heirs of the Maccabees, but it has now been superseded by Hengel, cf. p. 225, note 5.

³ Cf. J. Neusner, *A Life of Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai*, Leiden, 1962, pp. 33ff.

⁴ *Life*, 17-19.

⁵ Josephus, B. J. VI, 300f.

sidered a genuine saying of Jesus, as long as it is recognized that it like its parallel Lk 19:44 was directed against the city as a whole as part of a political judgment.¹ There is no point in asking whether it refers merely to the outcome of the Roman-Jewish war² or represents a divine judgment at the end of the world. Before the event the two should not be distinguished. It is clear that Jesus did warn about the consequences of the political situation of his own time, and that like the Old Testament prophets his warning was expressed in terms of a divine judgment.

Specifically, the question of Jesus' relationship to the party of the Zealots has continually been raised because of the plain fact that he was executed as one.³ It is very significant that Jesus' message should have been such that the Roman authorities could have identified him with the Zealot movement. It has even been tempting for some to think that Pilate was essentially right and that Jesus is to be understood against this revolutionary background.⁴ Previous discussion of this issue has always been rather speculative because we really knew so little about the Zealots. Now we have been presented with a masterful study by M. Hengel⁵ in which for the first time it is possible to see the program of this group clearly defined. It does not seem likely that after this work it will be possible still to assert that Jesus was akin to the Zealots or that they are more relevant than the rest of Israel in understanding his message.⁶

¹ "Jesus spoke with the sorrow of a patriot rather than with the wrath of an iconoclast." (V. Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice*, London, 1937, p. 71) "He spoke of its (temple's) coming destruction rather in the prophetic manner of a punishment to come upon the nation than as a divine punishment against the Temple itself." (B. H. Branscomb, *Jesus and the Law of Moses*, New York, 1930, p. 114).

² This is the difficulty in the oft quoted statement of Manson, *Teaching*, p. 281, "The ruthless suppression by a great military power of an insane rebellion in an outlying part of its territory has as much—or as little—to do with the coming of the kingdom of God in power as the suppression of the Indian mutiny."

³ Cf. Cullmann, *Staat*, pp. 16-35.

⁴ R. Eisler, 'Ἰησοῦς βασιλεὺς οὐ βασιλεύσας, Heidelberg, 1929-30. His thesis has been revived in its essentials by S. G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church*, London, 1957², who combines it with the old Tübingen schema of the development of the New Testament church. This makes the older thorough refutation of Eisler by J. W. Jack, *The Historic Christ; An Examination of Dr. Robert Eisler's Theory according to the Slavonic Version of Josephus and Other Sources*, London, 1933, still relevant.

⁵ M. Hengel, *Die Zeloten. Untersuchungen zur jüdischen Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I. bis 70 n. Chr.*, Leiden, 1961.

⁶ Cf. the neglected but important earlier work of H. Loewe, "Render

In a modest discussion at the end of his book of the relationship between the Zealots and the New Testament, Hengel concludes that while Jesus was falsely accused of being a Zealot, insofar as his teaching has any contact with theirs it is directed against them.¹ This study is important not in showing direct connection but in helping us to understand the political climate of first century Israel, so that we see that Jesus in his way must have tried to answer the same problems.

If the threat of judgment does not exclude political aspects, neither does the promise of the kingdom. Put quite simply if rather naively, "if the Jewish nation had responded as a whole to His first appeal and teaching, there can be no doubt that, with all else that repentance involved, there would have been a profound modification of its actual attitude toward the rest of the world, and that the Roman power itself would not have had the excuse it actually had for being blind to the value of the Jewish faith."² The kingdom of God in Jesus' proclamation was not opposite to but on the contrary must have included a solution to the political situation of Israel. We would like then to affirm the essential genuineness of the kind of political preaching contained in Proto-Luke and not to divorce this from Jesus' announcement of the promise of the kingdom of God.

We begin to see now a solution to our difficulties in combining the two sets of sayings. If Jesus did not predict the emergence of the church he certainly did not predict the fall of Jerusalem. In fact he, like the prophets of the Old Testament, did not predict anything. But he did proclaim the fulfillment of the promises of Deutero-Isaiah concerning the kingdom of God, and he did threaten something of what would happen should Israel not respond to the proclamation. Promise and threat are not predictions but alternatives.

In this connection it is important to recall the concept of contingent prophecy.³ For example, the prophet Jonah made the

unto Caesar"; *Religious and Political Loyalty in Palestine*, Cambridge, 1940, who shows in a discussion of the tribute passage that Jesus' position on political loyalty did not essentially differ from that of the Pharisees.

¹ He refers to Mt 5:5, 9, 21ff, 38ff, 43ff; 8:11ff; 9:13; 11:28; 26:52; Lk 10:33ff; 12:58ff; 17:20f.

² Liberty, *Political Relations*, p. 14.

³ Cf. R. Dunkerley, *The Hope of Jesus. A Study in Moral Eschatology*, London, 1953.

flat prediction which could not be more definite, "Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown" (3:4). And yet this prophecy did not come true because "when God saw what they did, how they turned from their evil way, God repented of the evil which he had said he would do to them; and he did not do it." (3:10). That does not mean that Jonah was a false prophet because his prophecy did not come true, or that his proclamation was not true when he said it. If prophecy were prediction then we would be dealing not with free men and a personal God but with an abstract fate.¹ In the Hebrew view not even God predicts the future in this mechanistic way, and certainly his prophets do not. Typical is the following word of Yahweh in Jeremiah: "If at any time I declare concerning a nation or a kingdom that I will pluck up and break down and destroy it, and if that nation, concerning which I have spoken, turns from its evil, I will repent of the evil that I intended to do to it. And if at any time I declare concerning a nation or a kingdom that I will build and plant it, and if it does evil in my sight, then I will repent of the good which I had intended to do to it." (Jer 18:7-10; cf. 26:17-19).

The promise of the kingdom and the threat of judgment in the preaching of Jesus are not to be coordinated because they are alternatives dependent on Israel's response. Both however were meant as alternatives for his own generation. That Jesus was in fact mistaken in his expectation, that he did not anticipate the new situation brought about by his own death and resurrection, Pentecost, and the beginnings of the Gentile mission, may be understood as part of the mystery of the incarnation.² But if Jesus was wrong as a prognosticator, in a more profound sense he was not wrong as a prophet. If someone says, "This is a revolution; join it," if they

¹ Cf. J. Hempel, *Die Mehrdeutigkeit der Geschichte als Problem der prophetischen Theologie*, Göttingen, 1936, p. 41, "Die Mehrdeutigkeit der Geschichte auch dem Wort gegenüber ist für den Propheten vielmehr darin begründet, dass zwar das allgemeine Ziel der Geschichte: die Gottesehre, feststeht, aber nicht der Weg zu diesem Ziel: Gericht oder Heil. Dieser Weg ist vielmehr grundsätzlich variabel, insofern mit dem Handeln der Menschen auf der einen Seite, dem inneren Gespanntsein Gottes selbst zwischen Zorn und Liebe auf der anderen, Gottes Ratschluss sich zu wandeln vermag, ja sich wandeln muss. In solchem Wechsel wird das "Wort" mit innerer Notwendigkeit unerfüllbar. Nicht als unwandelbares Schicksal steht Gottes Ratschluss über die Geschichte, sondern als waltend-persönliche Wille."

² Cf. H. P. Owen, "The Parousia of Christ in the Synoptic Gospels," *Scot. Journ. Theol.* 12 (1959), 171-192.

do it is, and if they do not it is not. There is a sense then in which Jesus' announcement of the nearness of the kingdom of God is true if people enter the kingdom but not true if they do not. Therefore Jesus' eschatological expectation is to be seen as exhortation and threat and not as apocalyptic prediction.¹

If we are dealing not with apocalyptic prediction but with eschatological exhortation and threat, there is then no contrast between Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God and the threat of historical disaster. Indeed, one positively requires the other. It is important to note, however, that they both refer to all of Israel and are alternatives. Any attempt to make the promise refer to one group and the threat to another, or to put them in chronological sequence one after the other, would represent a serious misunderstanding. And yet this is just what happened in New Testament prophecy, to a discussion of which we must soon turn.

C. Israel and the Gentiles

We should perhaps note just briefly here the place of the Gentiles in the expectation of Jesus and the early church, insofar as this has a bearing on the question of eschatology.² There has developed today a certain consensus, as a representative of which we can cite es-

¹ Cf. the fine words of G. Harder, "Das eschatologische Geschichtsbild der sogenannten kleinen Apokalypse Markus 13," *Theologia Viatorum*, Berlin, 1952, pp. 71-107, pp. 94-95, n. 45, "Man sollte die Naherwartung Jesu in ihrer Echtheit stehen lassen. Im Augenblick ihrer Verkündigung war sie wahr, d.h. gültige Verkündigung des Willens Gottes, seiner Drohung und Verheissung. Die Entwicklung in der Urchristenheit und ihr Niederschlag im Neuen Testament zeigt, dass Gottes Wort sich nicht zum Besitz des Menschen machen lässt, als könne er es zum Mittel seiner endzeitlichen Berechnung machen. Es ist dem Menschen nicht gegeben, um sich zu sichern. Wer es dennoch versucht, es auf diese Art zu verstehen und sich anzueignen, muss erfahren, dass Gott frei ist, seinen Willen und sein Wort jederzeit zu ändern, wie es nicht grossartiger als in Jeremia 18 ausgedrückt werden kann. Gott kann sein Vorsatz gereuen. Mit dem Kommen Jesu war das Ende in der Tat ganz nahe herbeigekommen. Wer die Geschichte der Christenheit bis zum heutigen Tage mit Aufmerksamkeit betrachtet, wird verstehen, weshalb es Gott gereute, dieses Ende kommen zu lassen."

² Cf. the interesting series of articles which appeared on this theme in 1941-42: O. Cullmann, "Eschatologie und Mission im Neuen Testament," *EMM* 85 (1941), 98-108; O. Michel, "Menschensohn und Völkerwelt," *EMZ* 2 (1941), 257-267; W. Freytag, "Mission im Blick aufs Ende," *EMZ* 3 (1942), 321-333; H. Schlier, "Die Entscheidung für die Heidenmission in der Urchristenheit," *EMZ* 3 (1942), and a bit later G. Stählin, "Die Endschau Jesu und die Heidenmission," *EMZ* 7 (1950), 97-105, 134-147.

pecially J. Jeremias,¹ that Jesus restricted his preaching to Israel, but that this was ultimately for the sake of the Gentiles. As Paul puts it, "Christ became a servant to the circumcised to show God's truthfulness, 1. in order to confirm the promises given to the patriarchs, and 2. in order that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy" (Rm 15:8f). The place of the Gentiles in the eschatological expectations of Israel is seen most clearly in the prophecy of Deutero-Isaiah,² and we suggested that Jesus' proclamation could be summed up in the simple statement: today the promises of Deutero-Isaiah are in the process of fulfillment. Insofar as this is what Jesus means by the kingdom of God, then the concept of the kingdom also includes the Gentiles. The Son of Man of Daniel also includes the Gentiles³ and therefore Mt 28:18-20 says that the exaltation of the Son of Man means that the disciples should make disciples of all nations. The new temple will be according to Mk 11:17 a "house of prayer for all nations" (cf. Is 56:1-8 and perhaps also Mt 10:9f), and the Zion tradition includes the hope of the eschatological pilgrimage of the Gentiles. The salvation of the Gentiles was then definitely included in Jesus' eschatological expectation.

The first crisis in the church, that Jesus was alone in his death and resurrection, did not make any difference at all in this expectation. The Palestinian church continued Jesus' preaching to Israel with all the more certainty of its fulfillment just because Jesus had been raised from the dead. Within one generation all Israel would hear and joyfully receive the good news of the kingdom of God and the Gentiles would come into this kingdom and then would be the end. Who is to say that the early church was wrong in this near expectation, or what would have happened had Israel responded as they had hoped? As Paul says, "What will their (Israel's) acceptance (of the gospel) mean but life from the dead?" (Rm 11:15). However, one cannot really speak about what might have been, and in fact the expectation of the early church was not fulfilled.

The second and greatest crisis in the history of the early church

¹ *Jesus' Promise to the Nations*. The excellent book by F. Hahn, *Das Verständnis der Mission im Neuen Testament*, Neukirchen, 1965², while broader in scope, does not really differ from the position of Jeremias on Jesus and the Gentiles.

² Cf. H. W. Wolff, "Israel und die Völker bei Deuterjesaja," *EMZ* 8 (1951), 1-14; M. Martin-Achard, *A Light to the Nations*, Edinburgh, 1962, pp. 8-31.

³ O. Michel, "Menschensohn und Völkerwelt".

occurred with their failure to persuade Israel as a whole that the promised time of salvation had come. Goguel speaks specifically of the crisis of A.D. 44,¹ but perhaps it would be better to speak of a whole decade of crisis. The important events can be listed as follows:

- A.D. 40 The attempt by Caligula to desecrate the temple, the influence of which can be seen in Mk 13 and 2 Thes 2.
- 42 The persecution of Herod Agrippa, allied with the Pharisees, in which James son of Zebedee was killed, and Peter and the Twelve fled Jerusalem. The *Kerygma Petrou* dates the end of the mission to Israel and the beginning of the mission to the Gentiles from this period: (Jesus said to Peter and the Twelve,) "After twelve years go out into the world, that no one may say, 'We have not heard.'" (Clem. Alex. Strom. VI, 5, 43).
- 44-46 The Theudas uprising and a resurgence of Zealot sentiment.
- 46 Famine in Judea.
- 49 The Apostolic Council recognizes the legitimacy of the Gentile mission, and thereby also admits the relative failure of the Jerusalem mission.
- 50-52 Renewed Zelotic terror, involving not only a rejection of the political preaching of the church but even persecution (1 Thes 2:14f).

The mission of the Jerusalem church to Israel continued under the leadership of James in spite of their frustrated expectation. We catch glimpses of this discouragement in Proto-Luke and in Rm 9.² Nevertheless they continued to the end faithful to this task and loyal to Israel. It is probable that this church disappeared completely in the catastrophe of the war of 66-70.³ What was not realized by many is that with the non-fulfillment of the promise of the kingdom

¹ M. Goguel, *The Birth of Christianity*, New York, 1954, p. 106, "The years 43-44 were both for the church in Jerusalem and in a more general way for the development of Christianity a period of crisis." The events he mentions are a) the discovery of the Gentile Christian church at Antioch, b) the persecution of Herod Agrippa, and c) Peter's departure from Jerusalem.

² On the relationship of Rm 9 to the experience of the Jerusalem church, cf. J. Munck, *Christus und Israel*, Aarhus, 1956.

³ Cf. S. G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church*, London, 1957², pp. 167-184; J. Munck, "Jewish Christianity in Post-Apostolic Times," *NTS* 6 (1960), 103-116.

of God to Israel goes also the non-fulfillment of the near expectation of the end.

The response of the church to the crisis of the failure of the Jewish mission was at first only a change of strategy with no modification in their eschatological hopes. And yet in the wider perspective of Heilsgeschichte we would have to say that God changed his original plan in response to this new situation. "If at any time I declare concerning a nation or a kingdom that I will build and plant it, and if it does evil in my sight, not listening to my voice, then I will repent of the good which I had intended to do to it" (Jer 18:9f). The new situation called for a new act on God's part, and this was the calling of the Apostle Paul, who from the very beginning was called to be the Apostle to the Gentiles (Gal 1:16; Acts 9:15; 22:21; 26:17f). The concept of mission which resulted was something completely new, being neither centripetal and at the end as in the Old Testament expectation nor merely incidental as in Jewish proselytism, but centrifugal and central and now. It is in line with Jesus' concentration on his mission rather than his person that he never claims to be the Servant of Deutero-Isaiah, and he is only rarely so designated even by the church.¹ The Servant in Deutero-Isaiah is after all a community which not only suffers for the many but also becomes a light to the Gentiles. Jesus came not to be himself this Servant but to call it into being, and the most obvious instance of his success was with Paul. The servant songs are cited in the New Testament most often by Paul in relation to himself (Is 42:7 in Acts 26:17f; Is 49:1 in Gal 1:15; Is 49:4 in Phil 2:16; Is 49:6 in Rm 1:5; 11:13; Acts 13:47; Is 49:8 in 2 Cor 6:2), and he can even speak of himself in terms of Is 53 (Rm 9:3; Col 1:24; cf. Acts 9:15f).² In his important book *Paulus und die Heilgeschichte*,³ J. Munck shows how Paul thought of himself in relation to the plan of God. There was an essential agreement between Paul and the Jerusalem church, the main difference being only one of missionary strategy. Jerusalem said: first rebuild the fallen tabernacle of David and then the Gentiles will seek the Lord (Acts 15:16f), while Paul reversed the order to: first the full number of the Gentiles and then all Israel will be saved (Rm 11:25f). Otherwise Paul seems to have shared the outlook of the Jerusalem church, including their hope that the promise of the

¹ Cf. M. D. Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant*, London, 1959.

² Cf. H. Windisch, *Paulus und Christus*, Leipzig, 1934, pp. 137ff.

³ København, 1954.

kingdom of God would be fulfilled in one generation. There is nothing in any of his letters, not even Philippians, which would indicate the prospect of centuries and much which is clearly a near expectation. Paul conceived the purpose of his ministry to the Gentiles to be "in order to make my fellow Jews jealous", and this to bring about their acceptance of the gospel and "life from the dead" (Rm 11:14f). The collection he was bringing to Jerusalem (e.g. Rm 15:25ff) was for him undoubtedly a sign of the eschatological flow of the wealth of the nations to Mt. Zion (cf. Is 66:19f, where the mention of Tarshish may explain Paul's desire to go to Spain). It seems that Paul too did not realize the effect the Gentile mission would have on eschatology.

One of the three theses of H. Schlier's discussion¹ of Gentile mission is this: "Heidenmission gibt es nur unter der Voraussetzung, dass das Ende der Welt, das mit Christus angebrochen ist und die Zeit bedrängt, nicht *unmittelbar* bevorsteht." This is something which the first generation of the church did not realize, for they did not understand that a Gentile mission because of the unresponse of Israel and a near expectation which presupposes Israel's response are mutually exclusive. The Gentile mission introduces a new concept of Heilsgeschichte which progresses no longer in terms of time but rather as „der Lauf des Wortes Gottes durch die Völkerwelt als ein von Ort zu Ort laufendes Jetzt." ²

The great crisis in the life of the early church meant a transition from creating in Israel the Servant of Yahweh who would be a light to the nations to a mission carried directly to the Gentiles. For Paul the point of this transition came simultaneously with his conversion. For the *Kerygma Petrou* it was not until twelve years after the resurrection. For Proto-Luke the transition was not yet, and for

¹ Art. cit. His second thesis is also a good one: "Heidenmission gibt es nur unter der Voraussetzung, dass der Messias Jesus von den Toten erweckt und zur Rechten Gottes erhöht ist, seinen Heiligen Geist gegeben und seine Apostel ausgesandt hat." His first thesis however is completely wrong: "Heidenmission gibt es nur unter der Voraussetzung, dass Israel den Messias Jesus verworfen hat und dadurch selbst als auserwähltes Volk verworfen worden ist." That just the opposite is true, cf. among others J. Jervell, "Das gespaltene Israel und die Heidenvölker," *Stud. Theol.* 19 (1965), 68-96.

² Freytag, art. cit., p. 323; cf. Stählin, art. cit., p. 139, "Das ist das Schreiten der Mission durch die Geschichte: einerseits eine gottgeschenkte eschatologische Gnadenzeit für ein Volk nach dem anderen, andererseits das Weltgericht, das in jeder einzelnen Entscheidung, die an der Botschaft der Mission fällt, über Völker und Menschen ergeht."

the Jerusalem church it never took place. That there was a transition according to Matthew is made clear by the juxtaposition of 10:5f, "Go nowhere among the Gentiles, and enter no town of the Samaritans, but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel," and 28:19f, "Go therefore and make disciples of all Gentiles, baptizing them... and teaching them." Just when did he conceive of this transition taking place? We shall return to this question, but it will help in answering it if we have first some understanding of the New Testament prophets.

2. PROPHETS OF THE EARLY CHURCH AND PREDICTIONS OF THE END

The great significance of early Christian prophecy in the transmission of the gospel material has recently been very impressively advocated by E. Käsemann.¹ The suggestions he makes could when fully developed mark a radically new understanding of earliest Christianity and thereby also of the teaching of Jesus. We cannot in this section give to this theme the attention it deserves. We shall rather draw together certain aspects of the work of early prophets as we have seen it in Mark 13 and Proto-Luke and seek to discover why two such disparate conceptions as the end of the world and the fall of Jerusalem should ever have been brought together. As the key to the understanding of the work of the early Christian prophets lies in their peculiar use of scripture, we shall begin with a discussion of their most important predecessor, Daniel.

The book of Daniel was read for centuries in the Christian church as an apocalypse, as a mysterious book containing in veiled language God's plan for the history of the world and its end. Although the book itself is full of interpretation, these interpretations became in their turn mysteries, and it was the duty of the exegete to decipher these mysteries so that they applied to his own day, that is, to extract from Daniel a detailed prediction of the history of the world and to determine the place of his own time in this historical scheme, usually somewhere very close to the end. Then in our own time scholarship discovered the composition of the book in the second century B.C. and its relation to the history of its own time. But

¹ "Sätze heiligen Rechtes im Neuen Testament", "Die Anfänge christlicher Theologie", "Zum Thema der urchristlichen Apokalyptik," *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*, II, Göttingen, 1964, pp. 69-82, 82-104, 105-131.

with the expositions of the Newtons and Bengels still in their memories and enough of their modern successors still goading them by maintaining the composition of the book under the last of the Babylonian kings and "Darius the Mede" and thus its predictive character, modern scholars have continued this apocalyptic conception and added only the qualification that the book is a fraud. It is however questionable whether we should read Daniel as an apocalypse at all. We would like to take up a conception of von Rad¹ that Daniel belongs in the wisdom tradition and examine in particular his relationship to scripture.

It has today been generally recognized that the stories in Daniel 1-6 come from an earlier time than the persecutions of Antiochos IV and thus the rest of the book. Of them it can be said that they belong purely to the wisdom tradition. It is the old story of the young man who through his wisdom (whose source is in God) remains true to the religion of his fathers and prospers in a heathen environment. Such stories must have been especially popular in the Persian period. We have the story of Tobit, father and son, of Esther, Judith, and the three pages of III Es 3:1ff. The purpose of all these stories is the same: to encourage Jews living among the heathen to maintain the faith of their fathers. In spite of the persecution he has to endure, the hero embodies the wisdom whose beginning is the fear of the Lord, which is wiser than the wisdom of this world, and ultimately the hero triumphs and is shown honors by his former persecutors. It is important to recognize that all of these stories are "historical fiction", i.e. that while they all have their origin in the late Persian or early Hellenistic period, they ostensibly portray events which occurred in the seventh (Tobit), sixth (Judith), or fifth centuries (Esther, three pages). The first example of this kind of literature, the success story of a wise Jew in

¹ *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, II, München, 1960, pp. 319ff. Unfortunately von Rad on the whole discusses and criticizes Daniel as if he were no different from Baruch, Enoch, or IV Esra. It is a shame that he did not apply to Daniel what he had said in Vol. I, pp. 108f., about the postexilic wise men: "Weit ausserhalb davon (vom Kultischen) traten Männer auf, die sehr ernsthaft die Würde einer pneumatischen Erleuchtung für sich in Anspruch nahmen, die Weisen." Or again, "Es würde aber unsere Kompetenz überschreiten, wenn wir, ausgehend von einem vorgefassten Bild vom Propheten, diesen Anspruch nach-exilischer Leviten nur für eine hohle Anmassung halten und a limine bestreiten wollen, dass Jahwes Charisma unter veränderten Verhältnissen noch einmal in veränderter Gestalt in jener levitischen Sängerbewegung auf den Plan getreten sei." (p. 108).

a foreign land, and ultimately the source of all of them, is the story of Joseph. The boy Joseph remained true to the faith of his fathers and through his God-given ability to interpret dreams finally was made vizier of all Egypt. This same pattern is more or less repeated in the later stories.

Some of a cycle of such stories about Daniel—whether existing in oral or written form is of little import—were collected at a time when they had acquired a new actuality.¹ I say some, because we know of at least two other stories which belonged to the cycle: Susanna and Bel and the Dragon, stories which a later hand added to Daniel's selection. These later additions found in the LXX are very important for the study of Dn 1-6, not only because we see clearly the type of the success story of a wise man in a heathen environment, but also because we are able to see the point of view under which Daniel selected just those stories we find in Dn 1-6. We find that all of Daniel's collection has a certain relevance to a status confessionis of the faithful ones with respect to a hostile king, the situation which existed during Antiochos' Hellenization policy. We hear of a king who plundered the temple (Dn 1: Antiochos plundered the temple 169 B.C.), but also of the faithful Daniel who refused to eat unclean foods; of a king who set up an image which all men were required to worship (Dn 3; "abomination" set up in temple Dec. 167), but also of the courage and divine rescue of those who refused to do so; of a mad king who was humbled by becoming like a beast (Dn 4; Antiochos Epiphanes was called by some of his subjects Epimanes); of a king who profaned the temple vessels and whose end was therefore prophesied (Dn 5); and of a wise man who refused to depart from the worship of Yahweh and was successful in resisting the king despite persecution (Dn 6). We see therefore the relevance of these stories for the situation of the faithful in the great struggle against the Hellenizing party and King Antiochos IV.

Until now we have not mentioned Dn 2. As far as its purpose is concerned, it can be compared with the rest of Dn 1-6: to encourage

¹ If only because of the language, it is probable that Chapter 7 is slightly older than the following chapters. Although there is a long speech by Daniel, it still speaks of him in the third person; there is no reference to the temple desecration; and the time before the end is indicated only by the mysterious and traditional $3\frac{1}{2}$ times. The author of 7 was then responsible for collecting the stories of 1-6 and writing the concluding vision which gives them their theological unity, while 8-12 were soon added, but probably by a different hand. In a form-critical respect, however, 7 belongs with 8-12.

the faithful by showing that the persecution will not last forever, but that God has the situation in hand and will soon make his kingdom and victory manifest. But the form of this chapter does not concern so much the person of Daniel as it does the content of a dream he interprets. This is of course also an element of the other stories: in chapter 4 Daniel interprets Nubuchadnezzar's dream and in 5 the handwriting on the wall. It seems that this ability to interpret (פֶּשֶׁר) is a characteristic of the sage. Already the prototype of these wise young men in foreign lands interpreted dreams (Gen 40-41), and it is only here in the Old Testament that the Hebrew equivalent (פֶּתֶר) of Daniel's פֶּשֶׁר is found.¹ We have now come to the most important form contained in Daniel, that which links the two halves of the book—the peshet or (dream-) interpretation.

It is however not only dreams which are interpreted in the Old Testament. L. Yaure² has shown that Balaam פֶּתוּרָה means not Balaam of Pethor (as Dt 23:5 would have it), but Balaam the interpreter of dreams and oracles, oracles which he received in a trance (Nu 22:8; 24:3f). Samuel received revelation in a dream (1 Sm 3) and had the gift of clairvoyance, whereby, among other things, he was able to tell the whereabouts of lost asses (1 Sm 9). We have undoubtedly been misled by prophetic criticisms to undervalue altogether the importance of dreams and visions.³ But one point we can surely learn from this prophetic criticism (cf. especially Jer 23:25-28) is that the important charisma is not the seeing of visions and dreams but the ability to interpret them in words. Usually, of course, the two charismata are combined in the same prophet. For example, Amos saw visions, but they would not have been very significant if he had not also heard Yahweh's interpretation. And the same is true of the visions of Zechariah and the less extensively reported visions

¹ In Jud 7:15 the word used is שֹׁכֵר, hapax leg. The word for interpreter in the sense of a translator is מְלִיץ (Gen 42:23). While this may be too specific for the other two passages where the word is found, "mediator" is much too vague. In Is 43:27 it is a question of the priests ("princes of the sanctuary"), who "interpret" the will of God to the worshippers, and in Job 33:23 it is the angelus interpres who "declares to man what is right for him."

² "Elymas—Nehelamite—Pethor," *JBL* 79 (1960), 297-314.

³ It is characteristic on the one hand of the earlier view and on the other of the results of the prophetic criticism that whereas the *messages* of Amos are given the heading אֲשֶׁר חֹזֶה . . . דְּבָרִים (Am 1:1; cf. Is 2:1; Mic 1:1), the *visions* of the later Zechariah are introduced by הִיָּה דְּבַר־יְהוָה (Zech 1:7).

of the other prophets—it is always the accompanying word, the divine interpretation which gives them their significance.¹

But again, what is it that is interpreted besides dreams and visions? Let us leave aside for the moment the question of a charismatic interpretation and consider the wisdom tradition. The wise were capable of interpreting dark sayings, called *חידה* or *משל*. A *משל* is according to its root a comparison, and it is often used for a short pithy comparison or saying—a proverb. But it is also developed to mean a longer unit of speech, a parable or allegory, or in general speech which needed interpretation.² We tend to distinguish between a mysterious saying interpreted by another and the making of a parable, which is invented with the interpretation already in mind. But for the Hebrews *משל* meant both, and the ability to understand the mysterious sayings of others was closely related to the ability to clothe one's own thoughts in such sayings.³ Thus the oracles of Balaam the Interpreter which need interpretation are called a *משל* as well as the allegories of Ezekiel where the interpretation is already intended (Ezek 17:2; 24:3). Nevertheless, Ezekiel's allegories require interpretation if they are to be understood; the people even protest against his use of allegory for this reason (Ezek 21:5). And a certain interpretation is naturally presupposed by the Israelite author of Nu 22-24. There are of course other parables and allegories in the Old Testament which are not specifically called *משל*; the best known are perhaps Jud 9, 2 Sm 12, Is 5, and Eccl 12.

A *חידה*, riddle, is even more of a conscious puzzle, propounded to be as difficult as possible to solve; hence the wisdom of him who does solve it is all the more evident. The classical example in the Old Testament of riddles and their solving is found in Jud 14 (cf. Ahikar), but for our purposes the most interesting use of the word *חידה* is in other passages, where it does not mean a riddle in our sense of a consciously contrived question whose answer is known by the question-framer, but simply something to be solved.

In Ezek 17:2 we find the parallelism: "propound a riddle (*חוד*)

¹ Thus for Paul interpretation (*ἐρμηνεία*) is more important than glossolalia (1 Cor 14:5).

² We shall ignore the parallel development from "becoming a proverb" to a "mocking speech" (Is 14:4-20, etc.).

³ "Those who understand sayings (*συνετοὶ ἐν λόγοις* = *דבריים* of prophetic oracles?) become wise themselves and pour forth apt parables (*παροιμίας*)" (Sir 18:29).

חידה) and speak an allegory (משל משל) to introduce the allegory of the eagle and the cedar. In Ps 49:5 we find again משל and חידה used in parallelism, and the solving of them equivalent to חכמה and תבונה. Again, the problem of history in Ps 78 is called a משל and חידה. Most interesting of all is the passage in Nu 12:6-8 where the manner in which Yahweh speaks to Moses, "mouth to mouth", is contrasted with his manner of making himself known to the prophets, called במראה, בחלום and בחידה. Here we find all the forms of which we spoke which require interpretation: vision, dream, and riddle (or dark speech).¹

But to remain in the realm of non-charismatic interpretation, who was it who interpreted these "dark sayings"? Prov 1:6 says programmatically of the functions of the wise that they among other things can understand "a parable and its interpretation (משל ומליצה), the words of the wise and their riddles (חידתם)." Eccl 8:1 says that the wise are to give "the interpretation of a thing (פשר דבר)." Most clearly we find this expressed in Sirach 39:1-3, "On the other hand he who devotes himself to the study of the law of the Most High will seek out the wisdom of all the ancients, and will be concerned with prophecies; he will preserve the discourse of notable men and penetrate the subtleties of parables; he will seek out the hidden meanings of proverbs and be at home with the obscurities of parables." All of this is exactly what is said of Daniel. Aside from his dream interpretation, we find said of him generally that he has "an excellent spirit, and knowledge, and insight in interpreting dreams (מפשר חלמין = Heb. פתר חלמות) and in declaring riddles (אחידון = Heb. להגיד החידות) and in solving knotty things (משרא קטריין = Heb. לפתח משלים)" (Dn 5:12).

We come now to an important new development in this interpretation: the scriptures as something to be interpreted. This is a chapter in Old Testament exegesis which still has to be written and which will be of increasing importance in the years to come: the interpretation of scripture to be found in the Old Testament itself.²

¹ Hab 2:6 is difficult and surely corrupt. It begins, "Will not all of them raise against him a taunt (משל)," which fits the context of the following threats. But it looks as if someone for whom the text of Habukkuk was a dark oracle (משל) to be interpreted like a dream has understood משל in this sense and added as a gloss "and the interpretation (ומליצה)," especially since another gloss reads "riddles" (חידות).

² Cf. I. L. Seeligmann, "Voraussetzungen der Midrash-Exegese," *Supplements to VT* 1 (1953), 150-181.

We see the Sitz im Leben of this interpretation already in Ezra, the "scribe skilled in the law of Moses" (Ezra 7:6), who "expounded (דרש)" (7:10) and "interpreted (פרש)" (Neh 8:8) this law. But now we are concerned with another type of interpretation than that of Ezra, an interpretation which treats the text, usually a prophetic one, as a משל, which is to be interpreted according to the flexible rules of a symbolic dream interpretation.

We find this interpretation, this actualizing exegesis of earlier prophetic texts, as a presupposition of the post-exilic prophecy. This presupposition is made explicit in Is 34:16, "Expound (דרש) from the book of Yahweh and read," and though the texts expounded are not named, the general reference to earlier prophets (Ezek 38:17; 39:8; etc.) makes the relationship of these texts to such passages as the enemy from the north in Jer 3-6 clear enough. Can we gather from 2 Chron 13:22 (cf. 24:27): the "midrash of the prophet Iddo" that prophets are responsible for this type of exegesis? We see by the way the results of such a prophetic actualizing in the LXX of Isaiah, where the old prophecies are made to refer to the situation in Egypt at the time of Antiochos IV.¹ This interpretation is never called a pesher in the Old Testament; for the name we must go to a later period and work back from there.

According to L. Silbermann,² already in 1884 Ph. Bloch had pointed out the existence of a third form of midrash besides halachic and haggadic: a form called "petirah" which uses the techniques of dream interpretation, often based on symbolic association and word plays. This is of course the same type of midrash we have in the commentaries of Qumran. Especially interesting is the passage 1 QpHab VII, 1-5, "God told Habakkuk to write down that which would come upon the last generation, but he did not inform him of the consummation of the time, and when it is written 'that he who runs may read', its interpretation refers to the Teacher of Righteousness to whom God has told all the mysteries of the oracles of his servants the prophets." The self-understanding of this remarkable passage shows that prophecy was by no means dead in this period, but for now we want just to point out the formal characteristics

¹ Cf. I. L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah*, Leiden, 1948.

² L. H. Silbermann, "Unriddling the Riddle; A Study in the Structure and Language of the Habakkuk Pesher," *Rev. Qum.* 11 (1961), 323-364, referring to Ph. Bloch, "Studien zur Aggadah," *Monatschrift für Gesch. und Wissen. des Judentums* 34 (1884), 264-269, 385-392.

of this mode of interpretation. First the text is quoted, sometimes in a variant making it more amenable to the desired interpretation, and then the actualizing interpretation follows, introduced by the words **זה פשר הדבר**. The Aramaic equivalent **דנה פשר מלתא** appears Dn 5:26 in reference to the interpretation of the handwriting on the wall (cf. 4:21, of a dream interpretation).¹

It lies in the very nature of such pesher interpretation that it be charismatic. There is a sense in which even the guessing of riddles is charismatic, for all wisdom comes from God, but there it is a matter only of finding the sense that another wise man has hidden in his words. Pesher interpretation of the scriptures is in a strict sense charismatic, for the secret meaning has been placed there by God, and there is no rational way from the text to the interpretation. The interpretation must come, as 1QpHab II, 3-4 says, **מפי אלהים**. Thus Joseph says, "God has revealed to Pharaoh what he is about to do" (Gen 41:25, note how often the interpretation has to do with the future), Ezekiel introduces the interpretations of his parables with "Thus Yahweh has spoken", and Zechariah's visions are interpreted by an angelus interpres. Daniel too speaks of his dream interpretation as being charismatic (2:18-23, 28-30; 4:8; 5:11), revealed to him in his sleep (2:19). Finally, in the second half of the book, we find the most detailed description of the preparation for a revelation in the whole Old Testament, in this case for a charismatic interpretation of a passage in scripture (Dn 9). Daniel makes the claim to a charismatic interpretation, of scripture as of dreams.² Here is then a prophecy different from that of the classical period and yet a phenomenon which must be taken seriously if we are to understand the prophetic parts of the New Testament.

If we may be allowed to generalize on the basis of what we have discovered in Daniel we can characterize late prophecy³ as follows:

¹ The close connection between Daniel and the scriptural interpretation of Qumran is emphasized by K. Elliger, *Studien zum Habakuk Kommentar vom Toten Meer*, Tübingen, 1953, pp. 156ff.

² On the connection between dream interpretation and prophecy as charismatic exegesis, Josephus' claim about himself is very interesting: "He was an interpreter of dreams and skilled in divining the meaning of ambiguous utterances of the Deity; a priest himself and of priestly descent, he was not ignorant of the prophecies in the sacred books" (B. J. III, 352).

³ Cf. J. Alizon, *Étude sur le prophétisme chrétien depuis les origines jusqu'à l'an 150*, Cahors et Alençon, 1911; O. Michel, *Prophet und Märtyrer*, Gütersloh, 1932; "Spätjüdisches Prophetentum," *Neutestamentliche Studien für R. Bultmann*, 1954, pp. 60-66; P. Vielhauer in Hennecke-Schneemelcher,

First, prophecy has become conservative, the prophets being no longer direct messengers from God (of which the Botenspruch is the characteristic form), but rather tradents and interpreters of older oracles. Second, the means of interpretation is the pesher technique derived from the interpretation of dreams, and the result is something we can call charismatic exegesis. Third, the later prophets see their function in a manner similar to that of Old Testament prophecy to lie in the interpretation of the Heilgeschichte of the present.¹ The present situation is for them in almost every case a time of persecution in the last generation just before the end. Prophecy then takes two main forms: that of exhortation to endurance and the promise of the consolation of the end for the persecuted and that of the threat of judgment for the persecutors. At the same time, precisely because of their eschatological orientation, the prophets are very much concerned with the contemporary political situation and with interpreting "the signs of the times."

At least in early apocalyptic the approaching end of history does not mean a devaluation of the present period in history but on the contrary its importance is thereby greatly emphasized.² In his discussion of Essene and Zealot prophecy, Hengel³ emphasizes its historical-political character. He refers to Josephus, Ant. XV, 373, where the Essene Menahem proclaims Herod "King of the Jews", just as Ahijah proclaimed Jeroboam king (1 Kg 11:29ff) and Elijah was given the task of proclaiming Hazael king of Syria and Jehu king of Israel (1 Kg 19:15f). We are reminded of the fact that Akiba proclaimed in a similar prophetic statement concerning Simon ben Cosiba, "This is the Anointed King (רִבִּין הוּא מְלִיכָא מְשִׁיחָא)," ⁴ and we shall discuss below the acclamation of Vespasian as king by the prophets Josephus and Yohanan ben Zakkai. There are also prophecies connected with other historical events. Judas the Essene predicted the death of Antigonus (B.J.I, 78ff), just as Elijah predicted the deaths of Kings Ahab (1 Kg 21:17) and Ahaziah (2 Kg 2:4). Simon

Neutestamentliche Apokryphen, II, Tübingen, 1964f, pp. 408-454; Meyer and Friedrich, *TWNT* VI, 813-863.

¹ "Sie sehen ihre Aufgabe darin, in den Zeichen der Zeit die Zeichen des Endes zu erkennen" and on the basis of "längst geweissagte Zeichen . . . die Nähe des Endes zu verkündigen," H. Kraft, "Die altkirchliche Prophetie und die Entstehung des Montanismus," *TZ* 11 (1955), 249-271, p. 251.

² Cf. Käsemann, "Anfänge," p. 95, who says that "erst die Apokalypitik im Bereich des Urchristentums historisches Denken ermöglichte."

³ M. Hengel, *Die Zeloten*, Leiden, 1961, pp. 242f.

⁴ Cited in Meyer, *TWNT*, VI, 825.

the Essene predicted the revolution against Archelaus (B.J. II, 112f) and it is very interesting that he should have done so on the basis of a pesher dream interpretation. We see then that the consciousness of living in the end times and a political interest are not at all opposites, but on the contrary the two definitely belong together.

Thus if Jesus does have many of the characteristics of a prophet, we should positively expect him to have spoken to the political situation of his own time. In particular we should find nothing unusual about his threat of the destruction of Jerusalem, as this was threatened also by other prophets. There is first of all the prophet Jesus ben Hananiah, who before the siege of Jerusalem continually cried out (B.J. VI, 301):

A voice from the east,
A voice from the west,
A voice from the four winds.
A voice against Jerusalem and the temple,
A voice against the bridegroom and the bride,
A voice against all the people.

As the voice against the bridegroom and the bride comes from Jer 8:34, it is likely that the prophecy as a whole is ultimately based on charismatic exegesis. One cannot ask whether he is threatening "merely" the destruction of the city and temple or something more final, for before the fact historical catastrophe and eschatological judgment are not to be distinguished. There were other such warnings of destruction. The signs which supposedly occurred in the temple 40 years before its destruction will be discussed below.¹ Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai spent 18 years in Arav in Galilee as a young man, and being discouraged with the attitude of the Am ha-arez there he returned to Jerusalem with the warning: "O Galilee, Galilee, thou dost hate the Torah; thy end will be seizure by the Romans."² It was meant as a prophecy when John has Caiaphas the High Priest say that "it is expedient for you that one man should die for the people," although ironically the motive for Jesus' death was not fulfilled: lest "the Romans come and destroy both our holy place and our nation" (Jn 10:47ff).³ It was then not

¹ Cf. Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, I, pp. 1045f, and below, pp. 465f.

² J. Shab. 15d, cited in L. Finkelstein, *Akiba, Scholar, Saint and Martyr*, Philadelphia, 1936, p. 62.

³ Cf. C. H. Dodd, "The Prophecy of Caiaphas John X, 47-53," *Neotestamentica et Patristica*, Leiden, 1962, pp. 134-143.

unusual for a prophet to warn of the destruction of the city and temple, and it is not unlikely that Jesus and the prophets of the early church did so too. In accordance with the nature of prophecy at this time, it is reasonable to assume that Jesus based his threat on scriptures concerning the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B.C., and in any case the Lucan predictions are formulated in this language, as we have seen. We must therefore include the political element alongside charismatic exegesis in our characterization of late prophecy.

Defined in this way, the phenomenon of prophecy extends throughout the period of crisis from Daniel to Akiba. It has long been almost more a dogma of modern scholars than of the actual sources that the activity of the Holy Spirit and thus of prophecy ceased with Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. There are passages which can be quoted in support of this argument,¹ but they have to do more with a doctrine of the canon than with a factual disappearance of prophetic phenomena. Furthermore, the passages attesting to prophets in this period are much more significant, not only the references in Josephus (*Ant.* XII, 311ff; XV, 373ff; XVII, 43ff, 345ff; etc). and the fact that John the Baptist and Jesus were thought to be prophets, but the Qumran literature and much of the apocalyptic literature from Daniel on must be understood as prophecy in the sense defined above. There are also passages to be found in rabbinic literature which speak of the presence of the prophetic spirit (e.g. *Sotah* 9:12), many Rabbis are credited with predicting the future, performing miracles and the like, and the phenomenon of a direct communication from heaven called the *Bath Qol* is well known.² Mention of the *Bath Qol* however reminds us of the famous story in which Rabbi Joshua ben Hananiah refused to accept her judgment as against his own interpretation of the Torah. Although there still are visions and voices from heaven, the true place of prophecy is in exegesis. I. Abrahams³ quotes *b. Baba Bathra* 12a: "R. Abdimi of Haifa said, 'From the day whereon the temple was laid waste, prophecy was taken from the prophets and given to the sages,'" and he comments, "Not everyone who

¹ *Sotah* 9:12; *1 Mac* 9:27; Josephus, *Ant.* XII, 1; *Ap.* 1, 38ff. Not to be included here are *Pss* 74:9 and *Zech* 13:2-5; cf. Meyer, *TWNT*, VI, 813-817.

² Cf. Meyer, *TWNT*, VI, 824f.

³ *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, Second Series, Cambridge, 1934, pp. 126f.

opens 'Thus saith the Lord' is a prophet, just as not everyone lacks prophetic gifts because he opens 'It is written.' "

It is true that many of the characteristics of the prophecy of late Judaism differ from those of the classical period, and that one must suspect many of the apocalyptic writers of imitating the form of Daniel only. Nevertheless, as there is a line of development which can be traced from Amos to Jeremiah and from Ezekiel to Zechariah, so also from post-exilic prophecy to Daniel and from Daniel to the Habakkuk peshet and the New Testament. Perhaps the most important change in relation to Old Testament prophecy is the influx of the wisdom tradition. This includes a great deal of cosmology and angelology which has nothing to do with prophecy as such, but it also changes the nature of prophecy proper, which is now concerned with interpreting past revelation. The prophets are now the **משכילים** (Dn 12:3), the **דרש התורה** (CD VII, 18), who understand the **רז**, **מסתרים** (Dn 2:28; 1QpHab VII, 5; etc.) of the coming kingdom. This **רז** may be hidden in a parable (**משל**) as so often in the New Testament, or in words of scripture which are interpreted as a **משל**. Josephus says of the Essenes (B.J. II, 159): "There are some among them who profess to tell the future, being versed from their early years in holy books, various forms of purification, and apophthegms of prophets; and seldom, if ever, do they err in thier predictions." Daniel understands what was meant by the 70 years of Jer 25:11f; 29:10 better than Jeremiah himself. Similarly, the Righteous Teacher knew what the prophets meant better than they themselves (1QpHab VII, 4f). G. Vermès¹ defines peshet as "la révélation des mystères, de ceux notamment qui concernent la fin du temps." Prophecy in this time can be called a charismatic exegesis of scripture in reference to the mystery of the approaching end.

Christianity resulted in a great activity of the prophetic spirit, but in spite of the differences caused by the new situation, it remained in the post-exilic Jewish tradition. We hear in Luke already of pre-Christian prophets, Zechariah (1:67), Elizabeth (1:41), Simeon (2:25), Hanna (2:36), although as we have seen it is probable that their actual words as we find them in Lk 1-2 are due to the early Christian prophets, who have composed prophetic hymns to Christ on the basis of the new impetus which his coming gave to searching in the scriptures. John the Baptist is said by all the evangelists to

¹ "A propos des commentaires bibliques découverts à Qumrân," *RHP/R* 35 (1955), 95-103, p. 98.

have been a prophet (Mk 11:32; Lk 7:26Q; Jn 1:21, 25), and he is described accordingly. For prophetic traits in Jesus himself we must refer to R. Otto and especially to F. Gils.¹ Although many of the new insights into the Old Testament which we find in the Christian prophets may go back to the charismatic exegesis of Jesus himself, it is also probable that they were directed by the Spirit to seek many more Old Testament prophecies which had been fulfilled, a fact which is perhaps indicated when it is the risen Christ who says Lk 24:27, "Beginning with Moses and all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself."

The gift of the Holy Spirit was poured out over all Christians (Acts 2:33), and thus every Christian is potentially a prophet. Especially Paul cannot be properly understood unless it is realized that he was not only an apostle but also a prophet.² Nevertheless, we hear of specific individuals in early Christianity who seem to have exercised the prophetic gift in a special way. We hear of such prophets throughout the early church: in Jerusalem (Acts 4:31; 11:27; 15:32), in Antioch (Acts 13:1), in Thessalonica (1 Thes 5:19-21), in Corinth (1 Cor 14), in Rome (Rm 12:6f), in Ephesus (Acts 19:1-7; Eph 2:20; 3:5; 4:11). Individual prophets are also named: Silas (Acts 15:32; 1 Thes 1:1; 2 Thes 1:1; 1 Pet 5:12), Barnabas (Acts 13:1; 4:32), Agabus (Acts 11:27f; 21:10f), the daughters of Philip (Acts 21:9), and John (Rev 1:1-3). In the post-apostolic age, the prophetic tradition seems to have been concentrated in Asia, where we have the book of Revelation, the daughters of Philip, Papias, and later the Montanist movement (the "new prophecy"). If on the one hand prophecy tended into heretical excesses, on the other we find evidence of the prophet becoming a teacher and eschatological political prophecy becoming individual ethics. We catch glimpses of the travelling prophets Mt 10:41; Acts 15:32; 3 Jn 10, and Agabus is mentioned in connection with Jerusalem, Antioch, and Caesarea. In Didache 12:3 we can see something of the process of the prophet remaining in one church, and it is likely that we should imagine the

¹ R. Otto, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*, London, 1943²; F. Gils, *Jésus prophète d'après les évangiles synoptiques*, Louvain, 1957.

² "Seine (des Paulus) Briefe sind Paraklesen, sie enthalten Mahnung und Zuspruch, sie sind prophetische Verkündigung, die der Erbauung der Gemeinde dient."—Friedrich, *TWNT*, VI, 852, 11ff.

"school of Matthew" as coming from such settled prophets. Aside from the specific "professional" prophets, we should think of prophecy more as a function than an office, which the apostles, or indeed any Christian, could carry out. It was a very important function in the early church, as can be seen by the fact that the prophets are named just after the apostles in 1 Cor 12:28f; Eph 3:5; 4:11; Rev 18:20, and their function appears from these epistles to have been primarily paraclesis, eschatological consolation and exhortation.

In a later period this paraclesis of the prophets seems to have become more and more de-eschatologized and individualized, just as the prophets themselves tended to become established in the churches as teachers. The pattern of the last great tribulation/parousia and gathering of the elect is applied to the individual Christian life. Already in 1 Thes 5:1-11 we can see the transition, where the image of light after darkness is applied not to the parousia but to baptism, and the armor with which Christ fights Anti-Christ in the last great battle with his enemies (cf. Lk 11:22), deriving ultimately from Is 59:17f; 63:1ff; Sap 5:17ff, is metaphorically applied to the individual Christian. Thus it was that Carrington was able to think of the material of Selwyn's persecution-form as part of the baptismal catechism.¹ Thus we find the same form of exhortation in the imperative and the same images of watching, darkness after light, heavenly armor, great tribulation, and the like, beginning in the teaching of Jesus to his disciples, continuing in the eschatological exhortation of the Christian prophets, and finally becoming a part of the ethical catechism of the early church. This loss of the eschatological and political relevance of prophecy in the later church should not obscure for us, however, its great importance in an earlier period.

We can assume then that there were prophets in the early church and that their activities included the transmission of sayings of Jesus, the head of their prophetic school. What is necessary in order to distinguish and evaluate prophetic sayings in the gospels is "eine Art Formgeschichte der prophetischen Tradition,"² but this remains to be written. Bultmann's classification³ of the synoptic sayings into Heilpredigt, Drohworte, Mahnworte, and apokalyp-

¹ Cf. above, pp. 56-59.

² H. Kraft, "Prophetie," p. 254.

³ *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, Göttingen, 1958⁴, pp. 113-138.

tische Weissagung is at once too broad and too narrow. The criteria are not specific enough, and it begs the question to designate all sayings referring to the future as "apocalyptic". Many of the sayings included in Bultmann's lists were transmitted not by prophets but as part of the kerygma of the church. On the other hand, Käsemann has shown that at least some of the sayings Bultmann included under laws and community rules are in reality prophetic Sätze heiligen Rechtes.¹

We could attempt to use as a criterion the characterization of late prophecy we derived from Daniel: that it is an application to the present of older oracles interpreted in terms of a charismatic exegesis. Here however we come upon a double difficulty. We can see the results of prophetic searching of the scriptures in Mark 13 and in such a prophetic work as Revelation,² and Paul says that the Old Testament was "written for our instruction" and a source of paraenesis (Rm 15:4), but it is only in 1 Pet 1:10f that we hear specifically that the prophets learned through searching the scriptures about the present tribulation and the coming redemption: ³ "The prophets who prophesied of the grace that was to be yours searched and inquired about this salvation; they inquired what person or time was indicated by the Spirit of Christ within them when predicting the sufferings unto Christ and the subsequent glory." The new Testament writings were not written for those familiar with prophetic midrash, and we often see only the result of a scriptural interpretation without being shown the process. Second, there is always the possibility that the source of the prophetic midrash was not an Old Testament text at all but an oracle of Jesus. Then it is very difficult to distinguish the earlier saying from the interpretation given to it by its transmitters. In addition, the prophets were conscious of a much greater authority than that of the teachers who transmitted

¹ E. Käsemann, art. cit. Examples he discusses are 1 Cor 3:17; 14:38; 16:22; Mt 10:32f; 7:22f; 5:19; Rev 22:18f; Mk 8:38.

² Cf. A. Schlatter, *Das Alte Testament in der johanneischen Apokalypse*, Gütersloh, 1912.

³ Cf. also the Kerygma Petrou (Clem. Alex. Strom. VI. 15.128), "But we opened the books of the prophets which we had, which partly in parables, partly in enigmas, partly with certainty and in clear words name Christ Jesus, and found his coming, his death, his crucifixion and all rest of the tortures which the Jews inflicted on him, his resurrection and his assumption to heaven before the foundation of (the new?) Jerusalem, how all was written that he had to suffer and what would be after him."

sayings of Jesus, and they could themselves utter new oracles in the name of the risen Lord. Often quoted in this connection is the saying in the Odes of Solomon 42:6, "I am risen and am with them, and I will speak through their mouth."¹ Thus the messages to the churches Rev 2-3 are in the form of sayings of the risen Christ, and the prophetic saying 1 Thes 4:16f is cited as a "word of the Lord". (Contrast Paul's ethical teaching, where he is careful to state when he has "no command of the Lord" (1 Cor 7:25).) Thus it is possible that some of the prophetic sayings in the gospel tradition were originally sayings of Christian prophets, while others were genuine sayings transmitted and interpreted by these same prophets. A distinction between the two is very difficult to make on formal grounds.

In terms of content New Testament prophecy seems to take two main forms; paraclesis and crisis. We discussed the latter in connection with the political preaching of Proto-Luke in Chapter IV. Käsemann speaks in this connection of "die Konzeption des parallelen, wenngleich antithetisch gerichteten Verlaufes von Heils- und Unheilsgeschichte, der sein Kriterium und Ziel in der Parousie des Menschensohnes Jesus findet."² If Jesus warned against the consequences of a war with Rome, the Palestinian church did too. This warning was as we saw expressed in terms of a threat, and with the discouragement of the mission of the church to Israel this threat must have come more and more to the fore. Thus what began as only an impossible eventuality came to be an expected certainty. The very history through which the Palestinian church was living would have made their preaching more and more apocalyptic in terms of the coming judgment.

We discussed the paraclesis of the Christian prophets, their consolation in the situation of persecution, in connection with Mark 13. A good characterization of this aspect is given by Käsemann: early Christian prophecy has not only the task „die Parousiehoffnung in der Gemeinde wachzuhalten und die von Verfolgung betroffenen Christen eben damit zu trösten. Sie hat auch die Angefochtenen in den Stand ihrer Berufung weisen, mahnen, warnen, straffen müssen."³ We would however have to correct his statement insofar as the prophets not only kept alive the parousia hope but

¹ Hennecke-Schneemelcher, *Apokryphen*, II, p. 624; cf. Vielhauer, *ibid.*, p. 426.

² "Anfänge," p. 95.

³ "Sätze," p. 80.

even created it. The doctrine of the parousia is in the New Testament a creation of the New Testament prophets, expressed in language derived from Old Testament theophanies and based on sayings of Jesus concerning the Son of Man.

We have seen how the Son of Man in the teaching of Jesus is in terms of a community which passes from suffering to vindication and through many tribulations enters the kingdom of God. This expectation was in fact fulfilled in the death and resurrection of Jesus. For the church as a whole, however, it was not fulfilled, and if the suffering of the martyrs somehow corresponded to Jesus' death, then Jesus' exaltation would correspond to his parousia which would bring relief to the persecuted church. We have seen how two of the few occurrences of the term Son of Man outside the sayings of Jesus are in connection with the death of a martyr: Stephen and James. From the time of Daniel onward the death of the martyrs presented a problem, and the martyr theology which developed was in terms of their vindication. This is the situation in which the term Son of Man has its roots in Daniel, and it is also true of the New Testament. If for the individual martyr it is enough to say that he will be vindicated after his death at the last judgment, for the persecuted church more is necessary: that this vindication come now. The use of the term Son of Man in this connection refers not so much to the parousia of Jesus as it does to the last judgment as the vindication of his persecuted followers.

We have assumed that the sayings concerning persecution and the coming of the Son of Man were transmitted by early Christian prophets. In this connection it is interesting to see how many statements concerning the persecution of the church are in terms of prophets being persecuted (a connection foreshadowed in the teaching of Jesus himself as we have seen, Lk 4:24; 13:33):

Blessed are you when liars reproach you and persecute you and say all sorts of evil things against you for my sake. Rejoice and exult greatly, for your reward is great in heaven. For so they persecuted the prophets who were before you. (Mt 5:11f = Lk 6:22f)

Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you build the tombs of the prophets and adorn the sepulchres of the righteous . . . you are sons of those who murdered the prophets. And you, fill up the measure of your fathers! Serpents, brood of vipers, how will you escape the judgment of Gehenna? Therefore I send you prophets and righteous men and scribes; some of them you will kill and crucify, and some you will scourge in your synagogues and perse-

cute from town to town, that upon you may come all the righteous blood poured out on earth . . . Amen I say to you, all this will come on this generation. (Mt 23:29-36 = Lk 11:47-51)

O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, you who kill the prophets and stone those who are sent to you. (Lk 13:34 = Mt 23:37)

Which of the prophets did your fathers not persecute? And they killed those who proclaimed beforehand the coming of the righteous one, of whom you are now the betrayers and murderers. (Acts 7:52)

. . . who killed both the Lord Jesus and the prophets and persecuted us. (1 Thes 2:15)

Not only is the correlation between the Old Testament prophets who were supposedly once persecuted and the New Testament prophets who are now persecuted very interesting, but we notice that these are among the most bitter denunciations of the persecutors. Evidently the New Testament prophets did not take very much to heart the injunction to "pray for those who persecute you" (Mt 5:44).

The internal function of the prophets in the situation of persecution was to comfort the persecuted church and exhort them to stand fast by making older prophecies relevant to the present. The grounds for the exhortation were two-fold: persecutions must be expected because they were predicted both by Jesus and the scriptures, and persecution will be followed by vindication because this has been predicted both by Jesus and the scriptures. This paraclesis, which means both comfort and exhortation, was so widespread that it has left traces in many parts of the New Testament. Selwyn¹ has worked out in some detail this persecution-form as it is found in Q and the epistles, and Nauck² has found a similar form, taking as a basis Mt 5:11f and tracing the joining of the motifs of rejoicing, persecution, and reward in the epistles. One element which neither of them mentioned but which cannot be denied is the longing for vengeance at the parousia.

When the attention of the prophets was directed not so much to the situation of the persecuted church but more to that of their

¹ E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, London, 1947², pp. 439-458; cf. above, pp. 56-59.

² W. Nauck, "Freude im Leiden; Zum Problem einer urchristlichen Verfolgungstradition," *ZNW* 46 (1955), 68-80. He characterizes the form, which he finds especially in Mt 5:11f; Lk 6:22f; 1 Pet 1:6; 4:13f; Heb 10:32-36; 2 Thes 1:4-6, as: 1a) Zuruf-Heil, b) Bedingung-Verfolgung; 2a Aufruf-Freude, b) Begründung-Lohn.

persecutors, then a different note creeps in. The longing for a speedy parousia is connected not so much with the end of suffering and the coming of the kingdom of God as it is with judgment on the persecutors. It becomes the impatient question of the souls of the martyrs under the altar who cry out, "How long, O holy and true Lord, before you judge and avenge our blood on those who dwell on earth?" (Rev. 6:10). It is the kind of importunate impatience found in the reinterpreted parable of the widow and the judge Lk 18:1-8a, which ends with the conclusion, "Will not God vindicate his elect, he who hears them patiently when they cry to him day and night? I tell you, he will vindicate them suddenly." This whole mood showing the transition from paraclesis to a cry for vengeance is nowhere better expressed than in 2 Thessalonians:

... your steadfastness and faith in all your persecutions and tribulations which you endure is proof of the just judgment of God, that you may become worthy of the kingdom of God for which you suffer. It is surely just for God to repay with affliction those who afflict you and to repay you the afflicted with relief, and us as well, at the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven with his angels of power "in a flame of fire, inflicting vengeance on those who do not know God and who do not obey" the gospel of our Lord Jesus. They will suffer the punishment of eternal destruction, cut off "from the face of the Lord and from the glory of his might, when he comes on that day to be glorified in his saints and be adored" among all who believe, for our witness to you was believed. (2 Thes 1:4-10)

The association of the near expectation of the end with persecution can be seen in connection with the three most explicit synoptic texts, Mk 9:1; 13:30; and Mt 10:23, to which can be added for purposes of comparison Mt 23:39. In the first place it should be clear that we are dealing not with four separate sayings but with four versions of a single saying:

Amen, I tell you, that there are some standing here who will not (οὐ μὴ) taste death before (ἔως ἄν) they see the kingdom of God having come in power. (Mk 9:1)

Amen, I tell you, that this generation will not (οὐ μὴ) pass away before (μέχρις οὗ) all these things happen. (Mk 13:30)

For Amen, I tell you, you will not (οὐ μὴ) finish the cities of Israel before (ἔως ἄν) the Son of Man comes. (Mt 10:23)

For I tell you, you will not (οὐ μὴ) see me from now on before (ἔως ἄν) you say: blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord. (Mt 23:39)

The form of all these sayings is the same: the solemn introduction, "Amen, I tell you", the statement with the emphatic οὐ μὴ that something will not happen before (three times ἕως ἄν, once μέχρις οὗ) the end of the world. It should be clear that it is the end of the world that is meant, and that in this context the parousia of the Son of Man and Jesus coming in the name of the Lord is exactly the same as the kingdom in power, including all "these things" of which Mk 13:24-27 speaks. When we consider that all these sayings refer to the parousia, it is doubtful if even the underlying common saying comes from Jesus, for the underlying conception fits in too well with what was being said by the New Testament prophets. Indeed, when we look at the context in which the sayings appear, if this saying were not there it would have been necessary to invent one. And in fact this is what has happened.

Looking first at Mk 9:1, it comes as the climax to the section 8:34-9:1, which could be called the heart of Mark's gospel.¹ It is made up of five originally separate sayings concerning suffering, interpreted of a martyr's death in persecution, and ends with the saying concerning the coming of the kingdom of God.² The first saying is: "If anyone wants to come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me." In the Proto-Lucan parallel Lk 14:27 ("he who does not bear his cross and follow me cannot be my disciple"), the taking up of the cross is a metaphorical expression for the cost of discipleship and does not refer to the cross as a means of execution. However, this is exactly what is meant in Mark, and if he is writing in the light of the Neronian persecution it may have been fulfilled quite literally, as tradition says was the case with Peter. The next three sayings seem to have been common proverbs:³ 2. "For whoever wishes to save his life will lose it and whoever loses his life will save it." 3. "How does it help a man to gain the whole world and suffer loss to his life?" 4. "For what should a man give as recompense for his life?" Mark has been able to make these sayings relevant to his purpose merely by collecting them in this context and by inserting the words "for the gospel's sake" in saying 2.⁴ These sayings, which originally had nothing to do with

¹ F. Busch, *Zum Verständnis der synoptischen Eschatologie*, 1938.

² Cf. E. Haenchen, "Die komposition von Mk viii 27-ix 1 und Par.," *NT* 6 (1963), 81-109.

³ Bultmann, *syn. Trad.*, pp. 79, 82.

⁴ The words ἐμοῦ καὶ are missing in p⁴⁵ D syrsin, etc, and it is probable that they are a later addition; cf. Mk 13:9.

persecution much less following Jesus, now combine statements of the preciousness of life with the demand for loyalty even unto death. The situation is almost intolerable, for who could remain faithful to Jesus even to the point of death? The point then of the fifth saying is to urge Christians not to be ashamed of him even if it cost them their lives, by the threat that if they are, Jesus will be ashamed of them at the judgment. "Whoever is ashamed of me and mine in this adulterous and sinful generation, the Son of Man will be ashamed of him when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." The situation of persecution and death and the threat of judgment positively cries out for a word of comfort and consolation.¹ This is provided by the solemn assurance that the parousia and the vindication of the persecuted will come soon, in that generation. Some will be killed and taste death, but the survivors should not despair, because there are also some of those then living who will experience the parousia. M. Barth ² would remove the reference to the parousia by referring the verbs "see" and "die" to the same persons, so that the sense would be: there are some standing here who will die a martyr's death, and all martyrs will see the Son of Man before they die (as did Stephen Acts 7:56). While this is a possibility, the saying would be then no longer relevant to the context, and the affinities to the other three sayings would have to be overlooked. It does have the advantage of pointing to the fact that "seeing the Son of Man" is a conception very closely allied to the death of martyrs. In context, however, Mk 9:1 speaks to the situation not of the martyrs themselves but of those facing martyrdom, and it holds out for them the promise of consolation.

Mk 13:30 is similar. If "this generation" is going to undergo all the tribulation which Mark 13 entails, and it is to be recalled that this chapter was formulated for people who had already experienced tribulation, then fairness demands that this generation also experience the promised vindication. If the promise of the parousia is to have any relevance at all for those addressed, then it must be promised for their lifetime. That the suffering of Israel should be greatest just before the end is not just some apocalyptic theo-

¹ The addition of Matthew to this saying, "and will repay each according to his action," is already a word of consolation for the persecuted and of vengeance on their persecutors.

² *Der Augenzeuge. Eine Untersuchung über die Wahrnehmung des Menschensohnes durch die Apostel*, Zürich, 1946, p. 90.

goumenon called Messianic woes; the point is that the suffering was already there and it was the suffering which called forth the expectation of the speedy coming of the end, and not the other way around. Experience of persecution is a disease characterized by apocalyptic fever, and the nearness of the expected end is directly proportional to the severity of the persecution. This acceleration of the end because of suffering is very well expressed in Mk 13:20, "If the Lord had not shortened the days no one would be saved (=escape a martyr's death); but for the sake of the elect whom he chose he shortened the days."

The persecution of the church was brought about by their missionary activity, and thus we saw already in Proto-Luke the tendency to join predictions of persecution to exhortations to witness. This tendency has been carried even further by Matthew in Mt 10. This discourse reflects quite clearly the actual mission practice and persecution experience of the Palestinean church. Vs 5-16 describe a mission restricted to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel", Vs 17-23 are an originally separate tradition concerning persecution, and there follows in Vs 26-42 a whole series of sayings, largely Q material, on the subject of witness and suffering in general. At the end is expressed very clearly the transmitters of this material: "He who receives a prophet in the name of a prophet will receive the reward of a prophet, and he who receives a just man in the name of a just man will receive a just man's reward" (10:41). The leaders of these congregations called themselves "prophets and just men," and it is they who led the mission and suffered the persecution.¹ Although the two themes, mission and persecution, are related, they are not the same, and the section Mt 10:17-23 was very likely originally transmitted separately in something very much like its present form. This means that there is no necessity to divide Vs 23 and assume that the first half must refer to missionary activity in the cities of Israel.² E. Bammel³ points to an interesting parallel in the Mishnah, Sota 9:15, where as part of the woes of the Messiah is listed along with a statement based on Micah 7:6 another which says that "the people of the frontier (?) shall go about from city to city with none to show pity on them." So too in the Matthew text (cf. Mt 23:34, where they are persecuted "from city to city"). After

¹ Cf. Käsemann, "Anfänge," pp. 89-91.

² So W. G. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfillment*, London, 1957, p. 61.

³ "Matthäus 10, 23," *Stud. Theol.* 15 (1961), 79-92.

the prediction that the followers of Jesus will be brought before magistrates and in dying will testify against them and a statement based on Micah 7:6, there follows: "But he who endures to the end will be saved. When they persecute you in this city flee to the next, for truly I say to you, you will not finish the cities of Israel before the Son of Man comes." Neither the witness against the magistrates nor the finishing, which refers to their wandering, have a direct connection with mission. The time of the coming of the end is not associated with the degree of completion of a missionary task but with the intensity of persecution. It is impossible to endure until the end unless the end comes soon, in the lifetime of those so exhorted. Thus the section Mt 10:17-22 positively requires an ending such as that provided by Vs 23. Here again we see how persecution calls for a word of consolation and that right soon.¹

The saying Mt 23:39, whose Lucan parallel Lk 13:34f we have already discussed, may be the root of the other three sayings. This means that references to "seeing" Jesus at the parousia originated not in a word of comfort addressed to the church but in a threat addressed to Israel (cf. Mk 14:62). The meaning of the saying in Matthew is given by its context, between the condemnation of the Pharisees Mt 23 and the eschatological discourse Mt 24-25. In this case the near expectation is not a promise for the persecuted church but a threat for Israel, that judgment will come upon that generation and then will come the end. Since Matthew was written after the end of the first generation this is very strange indeed. His special motivation for including a near expectation in this context will be discussed below.

We saw in connection with Proto-Luke that proclamations of the end of the world were transmitted in two quite different contexts: that of the promise of vindication for the suffering church and that of the threat of judgment for Israel. When the vindication takes on more and more of the traits of vengeance, and when Israel itself

¹ That Mt 10:23 is meant as consolation for the persecuted church, cf. H. E. Tödt, *Der Menschensohn in der synoptischen Ueberlieferung*, Gütersloh, 1959, p. 57, "In diesem Prophetenspruch, den man als Spruch Jesu geachtet wissen wollte, ergeht eine trostvolle Verheissung an die Missionare. Sie werden nicht lange in der Verfolgung ausharren müssen; denn der Menschensohn wird bald kommen." Cf. Also J. Dupont, "Vous n'aurez pas achevé les villes d'Israel avant que le Fils de l'homme ne vienne" (Mat. X 23)," *NT* 2 (1958), 228-244; H. Schürmann, "Zur Traditions- und Redaktionsgeschichte von Mt 10, 23," *Bib. Zeit.* 3 (1959), 82-88.

becomes the persecutor of the Christians then the two contexts come very close together.¹ We see the first expression of this in the Pauline outburst I Thess 2:14-16:

For you have become imitators, brethren, of the churches of God in Christ Jesus which are in Judea, since you too have suffered the same things from your own countrymen as they from the Jews, who not only killed both the Lord Jesus and the prophets but have driven us out and are not pleasing to God and oppose all men, preventing us from speaking to the Gentiles that they might be saved, so that they always fill up the measure of their sins. But wrath has come upon them at the end.

When we recall the series of events which preceded the writing of 1 Thessalonians such an exclamation is perhaps understandable. There was the persecution of Herod Agrippa A.D. 42, the Theudas uprising under Cuspius Fadus 44-46, the famine in 46, the expulsion of the Roman Jews (and Christians) by Claudius in 50, the renewed Zealotic terror in 50-52. By "the Jews" Paul means concretely the Herodians who "drove us out" (i.e. the Jerusalem apostles) and the Zealots who just recently persecuted the church and have been active against Paul. These are just the two groups against which the political preaching of the Palestinian church had been most directed, and the ascendancy of the Zealots seems to show that Israel is not responding to their preaching and that the threatened judgment will become a reality. This is now combined with the inner-Christian concern of the persecution of the prophets and the church, which also threatens judgment for the persecutors. It is no wonder then that we get the expression of a very strong expectation of and even hope for the judgment: "the wrath has come upon them at the end." That Paul can speak of a future event, the wrath of judgment (cf. 1:10), in the aorist tense (ἐφθάρσεν) is an indication of just how near his expectation was. "The certainty of the event is so overwhelming, the signs of its impendingness so sure, that it is said to have occurred, or to be occurring already."² What is astounding about this text is that here for the first time judgment on Israel is not

¹ Cf. E. Bammel, "Judenverfolgung und Naherwartung. Zur Eschatologie des Ersten Thessalonicherbriefs," *ZThK* 56 (1959), 294-315. There is however no need to speak here of a "Jewish theologoumenon" which is to be distinguished from the "Pauline theology". It is after all found in an epistle of the Jewish Paul. On the connection of 1 Thess 2:14ff with Palestinian history, cf. B. W. Bacon, "Wrath 'unto the Uttermost'", *Expositor* 24 (1922), 356-376.

² R. H. Fuller, *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus*, London, 1954, p. 26.

proclaimed to Israel but spoken of to Gentiles, and the wrath of God is said to come on "them" rather than on "us". This is the beginning of a very fateful separation. From the point of view of chronology, it means that the threat of judgment on Israel becomes not a call to repentance but a prediction which in its fulfillment can be used by Gentile Christians as a sign of the end. The destruction of Jerusalem changes from a threat to a prediction.

All of the elements we have discussed so far will have been even more applicable for the situation of Mark. He wrote just after a much greater persecution and at a time when the destruction of Jerusalem was becoming a reality. It is then not to be marveled at if he should have connected the end of the world with the destruction of the Jerusalem temple. There are moreover some even more precise reasons for this dating, and we turn first to them before discussing Mark's gospel.

We have seen how under the pressure of persecution the New Testament prophets tended to expect the parousia within the lifetime of the first Christian generation. Indeed it can be maintained that all references to an imminent coming in the New Testament stem from documents written in this first generation. Be that as it may, it has become customary to speak of this time as a period of intense "Naherwartung" which had to cope with the problem of a "Parousieverzögerung". The first can be readily granted, but I would like to dispute the second. Although it is never so clearly expressed, it seems that "Verzögerung" of the parousia implies that after one disappointment as to the date another was set, and when this was disappointed the date was postponed still further, until tiring of this continual delay and postponement the church gave up the whole expectation. It seems that such a view is really derived from the sad history of certain chiliastic groups in the modern church, whence it has been imposed also on the early church. It is doubtful that anyone would like seriously to maintain that there were in the ancient church prophets similar to the glossators of Dn 12:11f, who after the expiration of 1150 days had to postpone the end first to the 1290th day, and when this failed finally to the 1335th day. Although Jesus and the early church expected the promise of the kingdom to be fulfilled soon, and later the prophets nourished the hope for vindication of the persecuted church, only one actual date was set for the parousia: the fall of Jerusalem. We hear of a disappointment over the failure of the parousia to material-

ize only in two post-70 A.D. writings, Jn 21:23 and 2 Pet 3:3ff, where the problem seems to have been solved without too much difficulty. There can be then no question of a continual postponement of the parousia; it was expected at the end of the first generation, and then when it did not occur the church adapted with little difficulty to the longer perspective required by the Gentile mission. We can state here but by no means demonstrate our conviction that all of the New Testament writings which indicate a persecuted church with a heightened expectation of the nearness of the end: Mark, Revelation, Hebrews, 1 Peter, were written in the sixties of the first century. There remains for us to discuss the reasons for the specific expectation that the end would come as the conclusion of the Roman-Jewish war. This expectation is one that some Christians shared with many in Israel.

There is first of all the evidence of the expectations of the Zealots, expectations which were shared by many within Judaism. We have learned from Hengel¹ to appreciate the religious background of this "fourth philosophy" and also the difficult technique of inferring the real opinions of the Zealots from the twisted account of Josephus. The final rebellion of A.D. 66-70 seems to have been motivated by a prophecy that at precisely this time the end would come. As first century prophecy was largely a matter of charismatic exegesis, we can assume a scriptural basis for it. Our present task will be to try to determine from Josephus what this may have been.

The oracle is referred to by Josephus as follows:

They had it recorded in their oracles that the city and the sanctuary would be taken when the temple should become four-square (τετραγώνον) . . . an ambiguous oracle, likewise found in their sacred scriptures, to the effect that at that time one from their country would become ruler of the world. This they understood to mean someone of their own race, and many of their wise men went astray in their interpretation of it. The oracle, however, in reality signified the sovereignty of Vespasian, who was proclaimed Emperor on Jewish soil. (B.J. VI, 311-313)²

¹ *Die Zeloten*, Leiden, 1961. In reference to the New Testament he says, p. 386, "Die Frage nach dem Endtermin, d.h. nach dem Beginn der Heilszeit und der Möglichkeit eines menschlichen Einwirkens auf denselben—etwa bei der eschatologischen Deutung der Mission durch Paulus oder der Vorstellung vom vollen Mass des endzeitlichen Leiden—mag ebenfalls zunächst im Zelotismus gewisse Vorbilder gehabt haben."

² That there really was such an oracle in circulation at the time seems

Josephus says explicitly that the oracle is to be found in sacred scripture but also that it is ambiguous and was interpreted by the "wise". That someone from Judea would become ruler of the world would seem to point to a passage which could be interpreted messianically, but the reference would also have to be ambiguous. The most important clue is given by Josephus' statement that in his opinion the oracle was fulfilled in Vespasian becoming Emperor. We shall therefore first try to determine how this prediction was made.

In the well known story the prisoner Josephus predicts that his captor Vespasian will be "master of land and sea and the whole human race. For myself, I ask to be punished by stricter custody, if I have dared to trifle with the words of God" (B.J. III, 402). Josephus says quite strongly that his prediction is based on scripture but very tantalizingly gives no indication of the passage. The story reminds us of the equally famous story of Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai, and it may be permissible to turn to this for help. The two stories seem to be connected, and whether Josephus tacitly took his scriptural exegesis from his great contemporary, the underlying basis for the prediction is apt to be the same. One account is found in Gittin 56b, where Yohanan greets Vespasian as king and says, "for if you were not king, you would not have Jerusalem given into your hand, as it is written (Is 10:34), 'The Lebanon shall fall by a prince,' and prince (or, mighty one) means king, as it is written, 'And their prince shall be of themselves' (Jer 30:21), and Lebanon means the Temple, as it is written (Dt 3:25), the Goodly mountain, the Lebanon." To this can be compared the parallel account ARN 4, "This has been handed down to us, that the temple will not be surrendered to a commoner but to a king, as it is said, 'And he shall cut down the thickets of the forest with iron, and Lebanon shall

to be confirmed by Tacitus, Hist. 5, 13, "pluribus persuasio inerat antiquis sacerdotum litteris contineri, eo ipso tempore fore ut valesceret Oriens profectique Judaea rerum poterentur. quae ambages Vespasianum ac Titum praedixerat, sed vulgus more humanae cupidinis sibi tantam factorum magnitudinem interpretati ne adversis quidem ad vera mutabantur." (Dependent on this is Suetonius, Vespasian 4:5.) As Tacitus does not seem to have taken this from Josephus, they are either both dependent on the same third source, or what seems more likely, are referring each in his own way to a real oracle. One should not, as does Dornseiff, ZNW 46 (1955), p. 248, use the plural "profecti" as an indication that the Son of Man Dn 7:13 interpreted in a collective sense was the root of the prophecy. Tacitus simply wants to include both Vespasian and Titus in the prophecy.

fall by a mighty one' (Is 10:34)."¹ For Yohanan Vespasian is called king because he destroys the temple. Once this idea has been grasped then it would be possible to apply Is 10:34 to the situation, but it is doubtful if this passage is the source of the conception. Much more obvious would be Dn 9:26, "the people of the prince who is to come will destroy the city and the temple." We would like to claim that this is definitely the passage² Josephus had in mind, and that his interpretation, even more than Yohanan's, is but an opportunistic version of the Zealots' eschatological understanding.

Josephus understands Daniel to have predicted the destruction of the temple by the Romans.³ The fourth kingdom of Dn 2 and 8 represents the Romans as well as the Seleucids: "In the same manner Daniel also wrote about the empire of the Romans and that Jerusalem would be taken by them and the temple laid waste" (Ant. X, 276). In the course of the *War* Josephus makes clear that he sees in the activities of the Zealots the fulfillment of Daniel. It is the Zealots in the temple who are the "abomination of desolation" (cf. especially the speech of Ananus, B.J. IV, 163ff). It is the Zealots as the abomination who are referred to in the prophecy of B.J. IV, 388, "For there was an ancient saying of inspired men that the city would be taken and the sanctuary burned to the ground by right of war, whensoever it should be visited by sedition and native hands should be the first to defile God's sacred precincts" (cf. Sib. IV, 117ff). The cessation of the daily sacrifice was for Josephus the greatest calamity and a sure sign of the end (B.J. VI, 94ff, cf. Dn 8:11ff; 9:27; 11:31; 12:11). Perhaps most important in this connection is the significance Josephus saw in the death of Ananus, B.J. IV, 318, "I should not be wrong in saying that the capture of the walls and the downfall of the Jewish state dated from the day on which the Jews beheld their high priest, the captain of their salvation, butchered in the heart of Jerusalem." One final reference

¹ Both translations from the Soncino editions. There is a third version of the same story Lam. Rab. 1, 5, 31. For a comparison of the three versions cf. J. Neusner, *A Life of Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai*, Leiden 1962, pp. 114-121.

² It seems to be much more relevant than Dn 7:13f usually mentioned in this connection (Billerbeck, IV, 1001; Michel, "Prophetentum") or than Num 24:17 suggested by Hengel, *Zeloten*, pp. 245f.

³ Cf. F. F. Bruce, "Josephus and Daniel," *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* IV, Leiden, 1965, pp. 148-162.

to the destruction of Jerusalem being foretold in scripture could be cited: "Who knows not the records of the ancient prophets and that oracle which threatens this poor city and is even now coming true? For they foretold that it would be taken whensoever one should begin to slaughter his own countrymen" (B.J. VI, 109f). Whether this refers to the death of Ananus or more broadly to the civil war which was also an aspect of the Maccabean conflict (e.g. Dn 11:30ff), all of these events are seen by Josephus as fulfillments of the prophecy of Daniel.

All of these indications lead us to suppose that the ambiguous oracle which led the Zealots to hope for the eschatological fulfillment but Josephus to proclaim Vespasian king was Dn 9:24-27, a passage which certainly fulfills the qualification of being ambiguous. The relevant passages read: "Seventy weeks are decreed... from the going forth of the word to restore and build Jerusalem... it shall be built again with *squares* and moat (?)... After the 62 weeks *an anointed one shall be cut off*, and shall have nothing; and the people of *the prince who is to come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary*... for half the week he shall *cause sacrifice and offering to cease*; and upon the wing of *abominations* shall come one who makes desolate..." The prediction of Vespasian's kingship requires that it somehow be connected with his role as destroyer of the temple, and this requirement is met by the passage. We also find reference to the death of Ananus, the abominations of the Zealots, and the cessation of sacrifice. We have at least a hint of the strange idea that "the city and the sanctuary would be taken when the temple should become four-square" (B.J. VI, 311).¹ The most important aspect of the passage however is the chronological indication. Dn 9 is the only passage in the whole Old Testament to give any possibility of predicting the time of the end.

The "ambiguous oracle" was "to the effect that *at that time* one from their country would become ruler." Josephus says elsewhere of Daniel that "he was not only wont to prophesy future things, as did the other prophets, but he also *fixed the time* at which these would come to pass" (Ant. X, 267). In Megilla 3a we hear that when Jonathan ben Uzziel wanted to make a Targum of the Writings, "a bath-qol came forth and said: stop! Why? Because the date of the Messiah is contained in it (in Daniel)." When Josephus says that

¹ On this possibility, which contains many difficulties, cf. Bruce, "Josephus," p. 155.

the scripture predicts that Vespasian will be king, what he means is that the 490 years of Dn 9 are just about accomplished. Since there are no signs of such a chronology in Josephus, we shall turn to the Zealots who first interpreted the ambiguous oracle.

There is now no possibility of reconstructing the Zealots' understanding of Dn 9:24-27. Quite aside from the fact that the present text contains so many difficulties that we cannot even reconstruct the first century text of Daniel, their exegesis of the text would have been "charismatic", that is, just as contrived as some of the interpretations of Qumran. We learn from Josephus only that they read in the text a chronological indication (the 490 years) and that the ruler of the world, probably "the prince who is to come" of Dn 9:26, was understood as the Messiah. The anointed one who was cut off was for them doubtless Menahem, and the cessation of sacrifices would have been a sign not of a bad but a good end.¹ The fact that the siege of the city had lasted almost exactly the $3\frac{1}{2}$ years predicted by Daniel also greatly impressed many at the time. At the precise moment when the temple was in flames (B.J. VI, 249ff) and the abomination of desolation in terms of the Roman standards set up in the temple court as the object of sacrifices (VI, 316), at this precise moment when the prophecies of Daniel were being fulfilled, 6000 people went into the temple at the behest of "a prophet, who had on that day proclaimed to the people in the city that God commanded them to go up to the temple court, to receive there the tokens of their deliverance. Numerous prophets. . . bid the people await help from God" (B.J. VI, 285f). That it should be on precisely "that day" that deliverance should have come is because that day was the 10 Ab, exactly the day on which the first temple had been destroyed (Jer 52:12). On that day the 490 years of Dn 9:24ff were fulfilled to the very day.²

The Messiah did not appear above the flames of the burning temple as he should have. Nevertheless, the expectation that this was the proper time for him to come and that his coming should somehow be connected with the destruction of the temple continued. The two

¹ Cf. Hengel, *Zeloten*, pp. 248f.

² According to F. Fraidl, *Die Exegese der siebenzig Wochen Daniels*, Graz, 1883, this understanding is also to be found in Clement Alex., Origen, Tertullian, and other Christian writers; cf. also A. Strobel, "Abfassung und Geschichtstheologie der Apokalypse nach Kap XVII. 9-12," *NTS* 10 (1964), 433-445, pp. 441ff.

generations between the fall of Jerusalem A.D. 70 and the final disappointment under Simon bar Coseba A.D. 135 were according to Klausner¹ the great formative period of messianic expectation among the Tannaim. Here the expectations of the Zealots were preserved, including their dating of the event. The chronology of R. Jose ben Chalaphtha (c. 150) still preserves the concept that the end of Daniel's 490 years occurred on 10 Ab A.D. 70 (9 Ab A.D. 68 in the Rabbinic reckoning). Seder Olam Rabbah 28 gives the following chronology for the period from 9 Ab 588 B.C. to 9 Ab 68 A.D.:

Exile	70 years
Persian rule	34 years (sic!)
Seleucid rule	180 years
Hasmonaeans	103 years
Herodians	103 years
	490 years

As Billerbeck² says, "Das Dogma, dass der Zeitpunkt der Zerstörung Jerusalems 68 n. Chr. das Ende der 70 Jahrwochen bedeute, dass also der Messias am 9. Ab 68 n. Chr. hätte erscheinen sollen, stand dem R. Jose noch in der Mitte des 2. Jahrhunderts so unerschütterlich fest, dass er lieber 166 Jahre aus dem Verlauf der Geschichte strich, als dass er jenes Dogma aufgab." Indeed there were some who said that the Messiah *did* come when the temple was destroyed but now remains hidden until Israel is worthy to receive him.

Lam. Rab. 1:16 (cf. jBer 5a)³ tells the story of a man who was plowing when an Arab told him that the temple was destroyed and the Messiah was born in Bethlehem, a Messiah called Comforter son

¹ *The Messianic Idea in Israel*, New York, 1955, pp. 391-407.

² *Kommentar*, IV, 1007; cf. also pp. 995f, "Als dann der Tempel in Flammen aufgegangen war und die rettende Gotteshand sich nicht zeigte, gaben viele den Glauben, dass der Untergang Jerusalems das Ende der 70 Jahrwochen Daniels bedeute, keineswegs auf; man forschte vielmehr nach dem Grunde, weshalb das messianische Gottesreich sich nicht sofort nach Schluss jener Wochen offenbart habe."

³ Soncino edition, p. 137. For other passages on the hidden Messiah born in A.D. 70, cf. Billerbeck, II, 339f. Jerome in his commentary on Dn 9:24 also mentions that the Jews of his time thought the Messiah to have been born on the day the temple was destroyed.

of Hezekiah. The man then travelled about selling children's clothes and looking for the Messiah. When he found one woman who would not buy, "he asked her, 'Why do you not buy children's felt garments?' She answered, 'Because a hard fate is in store for my child.' 'Why?' he asked; and she answered, 'Because close on his coming the temple was destroyed.' He said to her, 'We trust in the Lord of the Universe that as close on his coming it was destroyed so close on his coming it will be rebuilt.' " Then a whirlwind carried the child away to remain hidden until the time comes for him to be revealed to Israel. "R. Abun said: Why should I learn this from an Arab when there is an explicit text wherein it is stated, And Lebanon shall fall by a mighty one (Is 10:34), which is followed by, And there shall come forth a shoot out of the stock of Jesse, and a twig shall grow forth out of his roots (Is 11:1)?" This story contains two elements which indicate an early tradition, the application of Is 10:34 to the destruction of the temple, and the fact that the story is designed to meet a situation just after the fall of the temple to explain why the expected Messiah had not come.

The more common solution to the problem seems to have been that provided by R. Eliezer ben Hyrcanus. In a discussion with R. Joshua ben Chananiah¹ he maintained that the coming of the final redemption depended no longer on an apocalyptic plan but only on the repentance of Israel. "Jene 70 Jahrwochen sind für ihn am 9. Ab 68 n. Chr., dem Tage der Tempelzerstörung durch Titus, zu Ende gegangen; an diesem Tage hätte also das Regiment des Messias einsetzen müssen. Dass dies nicht geschah, hat nach R. Eliezer seinen Grund in der Sündhaftigkeit Israels.... Wenn die Israeliten nicht Busse tun, werden sie in Ewigkeit nicht erlöst werden."² As Rab put it later, "All dates for the end have expired and the matter now depends solely on repentance and good works" (San 97b). We mention R. Eliezer in this connection, however, not because of his solution to the problem but because his expectation that the Messiah should have come with the destruction of Jerusalem may be connected with another tradition: that the messianic age would last 40 years.

The statement that the messianic age lasts 40 years is connected

¹ San 97b; cited in Billerbeck, I, 163.

² Billerbeck, IV, 992; cf. Hengel, *Zeloten*, p. 130, n. 3, "Vielleicht hatte Eliezer das Ende im Zusammenhang mit der Tempelzerstörung erwartet und führte sein Ausbleiben auf die Unbussfertigkeit Israels zurück."

with the names of both Eliezer and Akiba. Billerbeck¹ and Jeremias² claim that the tradition really originates with Akiba, who said, „Gleichwie die Israeliten 40 Jahre in der Wüste zugebracht haben, so wird er (der Messias) sie fortschleppen und in die Wüste ausziehen lassen und Salzkraut und Ginster essen lassen (Hi 30:4).”³ More original however seems to be the tradition based on Dt 8:3, “He humbled you and let you hunger,” and Ps 90:15, “Make us glad as many days as thou hast afflicted us,” texts cited by Eliezer San 99a.⁴ In the same passage Eliezer bases the 40 years also on Ps 95:10, “For 40 years I loathed that generation.” This whole tradition would seem to have little connection with the time of Akiba but fits in very well with the time of Eliezer. It is to be noted that the emphasis is on 40 years of affliction, to which the messianic age would correspond. If Eliezer expected the Messiah in the year 70, then the 40 years of affliction would lie in the years 30-70 A.D.⁵

It is surely in this connection that we are to understand the various signs that supposedly presaged the destruction of the temple 40 years earlier. “Forty years before the destruction of the temple... the doors of the sanctuary opened by themselves, until Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai rebuked them, saying, ‘O Temple! Temple! Why do you yourself give the alarm? I know about you that you will be destroyed, for Zechariah ben Ido has already prophesied concerning thee, “Open thy doors, O Lebanon, that the fire may consume thy cedars” (Zech 11:1)’ ” (Yoma 39b). There is surely a connection here with Josephus, B.J. VI, 294, where Josephus says that the gate opened by itself not 40 but 4 years before the destruction of the temple.⁶ As the Rabbinic tradition seems to be later

¹ *Kommentar*, III, 824-827; IV, 817.

² *TWNT*, IV, 865.

³ Tanch. עקב 7b, cited by Jeremias, loc. cit.

⁴ The same texts are adduced by Akiba, *Pesiq. Rab.* I (40).

⁵ It could be said that the destruction of the temple meant not the end but really the beginning of the final period of affliction. In this connection it is interesting to note how almost exactly 40 years after the final suppression of the revolt in A.D. 73 messianic hopes were revived and a new rebellion broke out under Trajan in 115-117.

⁶ Yoma 39b lists four signs, Josephus eight, and Tacitus (Hist. V, 13) five signs. While there seems to be literary dependence involved with the latter two (Tacitus on Josephus or his source), any connection between them and the Talmudic signs stems from the general belief in omens in antiquity; cf. O. Weinreich, “Türöffnung im Wunder-, Prodigien- und Zauberglauben der Antike, des Judentums und Christentums,” *Genethliakon Wilhelm Schmidt*, Stuttgart, 1929, pp. 200-264; S. V. McCasland, “Portents in Josephus and in the Gospels,” *JBL* 51 (1932), 323-335.

than that of Josephus, we have to ask why the sign should have been set back just 40 years. Connected with this are other traditions: that 40 years before the destruction of the temple the Sanhedrin lost the *ius gladii* (jSan 18a, 24b) and removed itself from the hall of hewn stones (AZ 8b; San 41a); and that R. Zadok began his 40 years fasting for the sake of the temple (Git 56a).¹ The fact that all of these things supposedly happened in A.D. 30 is an indication that they are dependent on both the conception of a messianic age of 40 years and the expectation that this age would begin in A.D. 70, that is on the viewpoint of R. Eliezer ben Hyrcanus.

A 40 year period of tribulation is known also in Qumran. "From the day on which the teacher of the community was removed to the end of all men of war who were apostates with the man of lies are about 40 years. And in this time the wrath of God burns in Israel" (CD XX, 13-16). "Its interpretation concerns all the wickedness at the end of 40 years, when it will be rooted out and there will not be found in the land any wicked man" (4QpPs 37 II, 7-9). Also the War Scroll describes a conflict lasting just 40 years.² It is quite uncertain whether we are allowed to combine statements from the various scrolls, but if we could it would be possible to connect the 40 years with the 490 years of Daniel.³ C.D. I, 5ff says, based on Ezek 4:5, that there were 390 years from the fall of Jerusalem 586 B.C. to the founding of the community of Qumran, and then 20 years of blindness before the appearance of the Righteous Teacher. A hypothetical combination of this with other texts might be:

Fall of Jerusalem to founding of community	390 years
Time of groping	20 years
Career of Teacher ⁴	40 years
Time of wrath, CD XX (War?)	40 years
	490 years

¹ Cf. Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, I, p. 1045.

² Cf. Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*, Oxford, 1962, pp. 19ff.

³ Cf. F. F. Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*, den Haag, 1959, pp. 59f; O. Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte*, Tübingen, 1960, p. 81.

⁴ It is nowhere stated that his career lasted just 40 years, but such a division of a man's life into 40 year periods was not uncommon; cf. for Moses Acts 7:23, 30, 36, and for Hillel, Yohanan ben Zakkai, and Akiba Gen. Rab. on Gen 50:14.

While a connection here is quite uncertain, in any case the last 40 years represent a time of wrath, to be followed by the messianic age. R. Eliezer was then not the first to hold this conception, and when we consider that the 40 years are based on Israel's 40 years wandering in the wilderness, which can be understood typologically in a good or a bad sense, it seems that also the idea of messianic age of 40 years is older than R. Eliezer.

Also in the New Testament we find evidence of a typological use of the 40 years in the wilderness. Hebrews 3f also quotes Ps 95 in this connection, warning the church to be faithful in this time of testing so that they may enter the sabbath rest of God. There is no reason at all to ignore the 40 years in the typological application, a very strong argument for a pre-70 date for Hebrews.¹ For the church the present time was of course already the messianic age, so that there was no need to posit two 40 years periods as did R. Eliezer. The present was the time of the presence of the risen Christ, who was leading his people through a time of testing into the promised land. Whether the connection was ever made between the risen Christ as the prophet like Joshua² and the fall of Jerusalem-Jericho³ is not at all sure but at least conceivable. Insofar as this typology of the desert generation was alive in the church, and insofar as there was a near expectation of the parousia before the end of the first generation, if one wanted to assign a number to the period of the messianic age the number 40 would have been most appropriate.⁴ By coincidence there were almost exactly 40 years between the resurrection of Jesus and the fall of Jerusalem. What for R. Eliezer was to have been the beginning of a 40 year messianic age would have been for the Christians the end of a 40 year messianic age and the beginning of the age to come.

¹ Cf. the commentaries of B. Weiss, Nairne, Riggenbach, Spicq, W. Manson, and C. F. D. Moule, *The Birth of the New Testament*, New York, 1962, pp. 44, 53, 122.

² Cf. above, pp. 277f.

³ Cf. Theudas crossing the Jordan (Jos 3:15ff) Ant. XX, 97, and the Egyptian who wanted to make the walls of Jerusalem fall down like those of Jericho (Jos 6:16) Ant. XX, 169f = B.J. II, 261ff. On the Joshua typology cf. Meyer, *TWNT*, VI, 827, and on the destruction of Jerusalem cf. above pp. 125-127, 151f.

⁴ If as we have suggested above Acts 1:1-6 is a second century addition made at the time when Luke and Acts were separated, perhaps the presence of the risen Christ with his disciples over a period of 40 days reflects an earlier belief in a messianic age of 40 years.

For a Christian living in the sixties of the first century all the signs seemed to point toward an imminent end. The end had been expected within a generation, and the first generation was coming to an end. The hope for the nearness of the end was stimulated by persecution, which the church had just experienced. According to the calculations of the best minds in Israel, the 490 years of Daniel were coming to an end. And according to the perhaps independent tradition of a messianic age of 40 years, it had been just about that long since the beginning of the Christian messianic age. While one cannot speak of *Parousieverzögerung* in the early church, one could very well suppose that the parousia must have been awaited in the very near future in this period. That such was the case can be shown with the Gospel according to Mark.

3. MARK AND THE FALL OF JERUSALEM

It is against the background we have sketched that the Gospel of Mark must be understood. We assume along with most ¹ that it was written in Rome after Peter's death and before the fall of Jerusalem, probably toward the end of the period 64-70 A.D. In this particular place and time span all of the motifs we have been discussing would be operative to the fullest extent. The Roman church had just undergone the Neronian persecution, which if we are to believe the account in Tacitus must have decimated the church. If ever there was a church which needed the consolation of a near parousia it was the church in Rome just after A.D. 64. The political preaching of the church had threatened Israel with the destruction of Jerusalem as part of the judgment, and this threat was now plainly coming to pass. According to one widespread interpretation in Judaism the 490 years of Daniel 9 were just coming to an end, and according to another combined with the Christian belief in the resurrection of Jesus, the 40 years of the messianic age were about over. It need occasion no surprise then if we find Mark expecting the parousia very soon. All signs pointed toward it, and his gospel was written for the purpose of consoling a persecuted church with this gospel.

It is commonly recognized ² that the turning point of the Markan

¹ Feine-Behm-Kümmel, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Heidelberg, 1965¹⁴, p. 55. The arguments of S. G. F. Brandon, "The Date of the Markan Gospel," *NTS* 7 (1961), 126-141, that Mark reflects the Flavian triumph in A.D. 71 are not convincing.

² Cf. T. A. Burkill, *Mysterious Revelation; An Examination of the Philosophy of St. Mark's Gospel*, Ithaca, 1963, pp. 145-164.

gospel is the confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi Mk 8:27ff. The term confession is of course a misnomer for Mark's gospel, for the whole point of the story is that Jesus is not the Messiah, as Peter says, but that he fulfills the role of the Son of Man. We supposed above that the application of Son of Man sayings to Jesus' death was new in Mark. It was important for him to draw a parallel between the situation of Jesus and that of the church, because this allows him to promise the church something equivalent to Jesus' resurrection. He does this by taking up the term Son of Man in its original meaning as Jesus used it and showing that the pattern thus established applies to both Jesus and the church.

<i>pattern</i>	<i>Jesus</i>	<i>church</i>
suffering	death	persecution
vindication	resurrection	parousia

According to this pattern the death of Jesus and the persecution of the church are correlated, as are the resurrection of Jesus and the final translation of the church. We shall have to examine how Mark does this in detail.

After the first anticipation of the passion Mk 8:31 comes the section Mk 8:34-9:1, which has been called the heart of the Markan gospel. In essence it is a prediction of suffering unto death for the disciples, closing with the negative aspect of the end: if they are ashamed of Jesus the Son of Man will be ashamed of them at the judgment, and the positive aspect: they should endure to the end for the kingdom of God will come with power before the end of that generation.

Mk 8:31 speaks of resurrection after the death of Jesus, and Mk 9:1 speaks of the parousia after the persecution of the church. There follows the story of the transfiguration, which some have held to be an anticipation of the resurrection¹ and some to be an anticipation of the parousia.² The whole point is that it is both, and one should not distinguish between them. It should be noted that the story is told not from a biographical or even Christological

¹ R. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, Göttingen, 1958⁴, pp. 278ff. It would in any case be more appropriate to speak of an anticipation of the resurrection in Mark's gospel rather than of a misplaced resurrection appearance story.

² G. H. Boobyer, *St. Mark and the Transfiguration Story*, Edinburgh, 1942; E. Lohmeyer, *Das Evangelium des Markus*, Göttingen, 1959¹⁵, p. 174.

point of view but that all attention is focused on the revelation to the three disciples; "before them" (Vs 2), "to them" (4), "overshadowed them" (7a), "you listen" (7b), "with them" (8). Remembering what has been revealed to them, the disciples will better be able to endure the coming suffering, for the parousia of Jesus and the final and permanent building of the tabernacles is not distant. At the same time there is a clear enough reference to the resurrection, at least for Mark, that there is no need for him to recount any resurrection appearances at the end of the gospel. There may be a further reference to the passion story in the notice that the transfiguration took place "after six days". Reference is usually seen to Ex 24:16, but it is also possible to see here a pattern taken from the passion story. The passion narrative begins with the chronological note that "it was now two days before the Passover" (14:1). Using the Markan chronology and counting forward from this, Easter would fall on the sixth day. In any case it is clear why the story of the transfiguration should be told here, just after the first anticipation of the passion and the first promise of the parousia.

If one had to give a characterization of the material which follows in Mk 9-10 it might be something like: the disciples' way of the cross, in which is contained teaching of Jesus for them telling how "through many tribulations one must enter the kingdom of God." The skeleton on which this material is hung is made up of the three anticipations of the passion, Mk 8:31; 9:31; 10:33f. Just as a collection of individual sayings is found after the first anticipation, so too after the second. These sayings emphasize the corporate nature of the Son of Man (9:35, 37) and that the fate of others in the judgment will depend on whether they have acted well (9:39f, 41) or ill (9:42) toward this corporate Son of Man. There are sayings concerning the self-sacrifice necessary for entering the kingdom of God (9:43-48), and the sayings concerning salt seem to refer to the sacrifice of the Son of Man which will benefit others.¹

Mk 10 contains a number of sayings concerning the conditions for entering the kingdom of God, concluding with a saying which reflects very well the situation of the Roman church and Jesus' promise for it. "Peter began to say to him: 'Behold, we have left all and followed you.' Jesus said, 'Amen, I say to you, there is no one

¹ Cf. O. Cullmann, "Que signifie le sel dans la parabole de Jésus?," *RHPR* 37 (1957), 36-43.

who has left house or brothers or sisters or children or fields for my sake and the gospel's who will not receive one hundredfold now in this time, houses and brothers and sisters and mothers and children and fields, with persecutions, and in the age to come eternal life" (Mk 10:28-30). The wording is very strange, even if the general thought is plain. Did the early church really expect to receive all of these things in the present age as opposed to the age to come? Since this clearly was not the case in Rome someone who was more of a realist has added the phrase "with persecutions", unfortunately in the second series when it really belongs in the first along with forsaking all. This only shows, however, that the main problem lies in the words: "and in the age to come eternal life." As it is stated this provides a contrast to the receiving of houses, etc., now in this time, whereas according to the sense they ought to be equivalent. Accordingly along with Taylor¹ we take the whole last phrase to be an unfortunate attempt at clarification. The saying then concerns a contrast between forsaking houses, etc., in the present and receiving them again one hundredfold in the kingdom of God. This coming of the kingdom in power is so imminent that it can be said to be "now, in this time". Here then we have another expression of consolation in the face of suffering.

The preceding concerns the coming of the kingdom of God in power as a relief for the persecuted church which has forsaken everything, and that right soon. There follows the third, most detailed anticipation of the passion 10:33f. Here the pattern of parallelism between Jesus' death and resurrection and the church's suffering and vindication becomes very clear. There follows the prediction of martyrdom for the sons of Zebedee before they will be able to sit with Jesus in his glory (10:35-40). As we saw above, the great saying Mk 10:45, "For the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve and to give his life as a ransom for the many," while it certainly has relevance to Jesus' death, is here used as the warrant for the injunction to the disciples to become servants and slaves. We assume that the understanding of the concept Son of Man in the Roman congregation was very close to Jesus' own and that this could be simply presupposed by Mark. For his perceptive reader then he has already firmly established the parallel between the fate of Jesus and that of the church before Jesus enters Jerusalem.

¹ V. Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, London, 1952, p. 435.

"Once the idea that Passion predictions were concerned with a corporate body, to which they themselves belonged, had established itself as a working theory in the minds of the disciples, there were a good many sayings of Jesus that would tend to confirm it. The Son of Man is delivered up (Mk 9:31): so are the disciples (13:9, 11). He is brought before the authorities (8:31; 10:33); so are they (Mk 13:9; cf. Lk 12:11). He is treated with hatred and contempt (8:31; 9:12): the disciples may expect the same treatment (Mk 13:13; Lk 10:16; cf. Matt 5:11; Lk 6:22). He is scourged (Mk 10:34); so are the disciples (13:9; cf. Matt 10:17). He is put to death (8:31; 9:31; 10:34): the disciples are repeatedly warned that they must be prepared for the same fate (8:34f; cf. Matt 10:38f; Lk 14:27; 17:33), although not all of them may be called upon to suffer it (Mk 9:1). We may also compare the saying about the Son of Man in Mk 10:45 with that to the disciples in Mk 8:35."¹

There now enters into the story a much more sombre motif, that of the judgment of God on Jerusalem and the temple. Mark is an heir of that prophetic tradition which separates the preaching of judgment from the preaching of the kingdom and instead of viewing them as alternatives conceives of the former coming first to Jerusalem, to "them", and the latter coming next to the church, to "us". Mark knows the rather bitter experience of the Palestinean church, who were not successful in their eager attempt to preach the kingdom of God to all Israel in one generation, and Mark also knows that from a political and military standpoint Jerusalem is headed for immediate disaster. He also takes up that part of the attitude of Stephen which was directed against the temple, so that there is a direct line leading from Stephen through Mark to the temple hatred of a Barnabas. Mark sees then nothing but doom for the temple and for Israel, and he sees this as a sign of the imminent end, which should mean redemption for the persecuted church. We shall examine the working out of these motifs in the story of Jesus in Jerusalem.

There are many indications that Mark sees Jesus' days in Jerusalem against the background of Zech 9-14.² Lindars³ analyses

¹ T. W. Manson, "Realized Eschatology and the Messianic Secret," *Studies in the Gospels; Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, Oxford, 1955, pp. 209-222, pp. 218f.

² Cf. F. F. Bruce, "The Book of Zechariah and the Passion Narrative," *Bull. Jn. Ryl. Lib.* 43 (1961), 336-353.

³ B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic; The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations*, Philadelphia, 1961, pp. 110-134.

extensively the use of these chapters as a passion prophecy. This is however exceedingly strange, for there is nothing in these chapters to suggest the death of one man; they are rather an apocalypse about the destiny of Jerusalem at the end of the world. Jerusalem's king comes bringing peace, there is the return of the dispersed to Zion under divine protection, the last great battle of the nations against Jerusalem, a strange mourning of Jerusalem over one they had pierced, the destruction of Jerusalem, and then the parousia of Yahweh on the Mount of Olives. In the coming kingdom living waters will flow from Jerusalem, and the survivors of the Gentiles will go up to Jerusalem to worship Yahweh at the festival of Tabernacles. Strange as it may seem, this sequence of events seems to be an important background for the Markan story. "The sequence of events in the Markan account of the last week in Jerusalem—triumphal entry, cleansing of the temple, cursing of the fig-tree, the saying about 'this mountain,' the blood of the covenant, the prophecy of the smiting of the shepherd and of the scattering of the flock, all preceded by the discourse on the last things—reflects a similar presence, if not combination, of ideas in Zechariah. If this is so, then Mark will have intended the events of this week in Jerusalem to be understood as the judgment and redemption of the last days, the punishment of Israel, the purification of Jerusalem, and the establishment of a true temple not made with hands, by attachment to which the Gentiles will be brought to worship the one God, and his dominion will be extended to the ends of the earth."¹

We have already discussed the five controversy stories contained in Mk 11-12, the cleansing of the temple and the question concerning authority (11:15-17, 27-33), the tribute question (12:13-17), the resurrection (12:18-27), the great commandment (12:28-33), and David's son (12:35-37a), to which perhaps the denunciation of the scribes was originally attached (12:37b-40).² Mark has prefaced the collection with the story of the entry into Jerusalem (11:1-11), made a few minor changes, and has added the parable of the wicked tenants (12:1-11) and two notices that the chief priests wanted to arrest Jesus but feared his popularity with the multitude (11:18;

¹ C. F. Evans, "'I will go before you into Galilee,'" *JTS*, N.S. 5 (1954), 3-18, p. 8.

² That Mk 12:37b-40 was the conclusion to a collection, cf. M. Albertz, *Die synoptischen Streitgespräche: ein Beitrag zur Formgeschichte des Urchristentums*, Berlin, 1921.

12:12). By so doing he has affected the tenor of the whole, for Jesus is presented as being completely in opposition to Jerusalem and Jerusalem as being completely doomed.

Jesus' entry into Jerusalem is seen as the fulfillment of the prophecy of Zech 9:9 (explicitly Mt 21:5 and Jn 12:15), which sets the stage for all that follows. It is not sure whether the leafy branches come from history in that in fact the entry took place at the feast of Tabernacles or from the theology of Zech 14. In Proto-Luke this is the occasion for a proclamation of peace as in Zechariah and a warning that the consequences of rejecting this proclamation would be the destruction of Jerusalem. There is nothing of all this in Mark, for whom any talk of peace would come too late.

We have already discussed at some length the cleansing of the temple and the story of the fig-tree sandwiched around it. We saw that in the original story of the cleansing of the temple the opposition was between the Jerusalem temple as the house of sacrifice for Israel and the new temple as the house of prayer for all nations. Mark however calls the temple a den of brigands, since the Zealots had taken over the temple precincts at this time. As the action of Jesus in the temple is based on Zech 14:20f, the teaching of Jesus may well have been in terms of the pilgrimage of the nations to Jerusalem Zech 14:16-19. In the Markan version there is no positive teaching of Jesus at all, and the implication is that because the temple has been turned into a Zealot stronghold therefore it will be destroyed. This implication derives largely from the enclosing story of the cursing of the fig-tree.

The story of the cursing of the fig-tree can best be understood when contrasted with the parable of the fig-tree Lk 13:6-9, of which it is surely a later development.¹ There when the owner of the fig-tree complained that it had not borne fruit for three years the gardener pleaded for more time: "Let it alone, sir, this year also, till I dig about it and put on manure. And if it bears fruit next year, well and good, but if not, you can cut it down." If as is generally agreed the fig-tree is Israel, then the gardener is the church, and it is their attitude which is here reflected. The Proto-Lucan church has experienced disappointment in its mission, for there has been no fruit for three years, but their reaction is on the one hand a severe threat to Israel (only one more year and the tree will be cut

¹ So Taylor, *Mark*, p. 459, and many others; cf. also G. Munderlein, "Die Verfluchung des Feigenbaums (Mk xi. 12-14)," *NTS* 10 (1963), 89-104.

down) and on the other a renewed determination that their cultivation may make the tree bear fruit (let it alone one more year and give us and the tree one more chance). In the Markan version the extra year has run out: it is now too late and the tree is simply cursed for bearing no fruit. One must beware of reading this story back into the life of Jesus. If it is morally objectionable for some that Jesus should have cursed an innocent tree, it is horrible that he should be thought to have cursed Israel. This can be understood only against the background of the Roman-Jewish war of 66-70 A.D., when to the eyes of Mark Israel was in fact cursed.¹ How could God allow such a terrible event to happen? It is almost enough to make the church, represented here as often by Peter, despair when they see the tree withered. The only possible answer to such despair is that given by Jesus, "Have faith in God."

The story of the fig-tree and the cleansing of the temple were intended to interpret one another. If the former shows that the latter means an anticipation of the *destruction* of the temple, then the latter should show that the former is about the destruction only of the *temple*.² While this is true, it is characteristic of Mark not to distinguish between the two. For him the coming destruction of the temple will be not simply an historical disaster but the judgment itself. Nevertheless it may be that we should think particularly of the temple in connection with the fig-tree. This is true also of the following sayings concerning faith, which are too closely attached to the story of the fig-tree to be based on mere catchword association. "Whoever says to this mountain, 'Be taken up and cast into the sea' and . . . believes . . . , it will be done for him."³ "This mountain" could very well be Mount Zion, which the church prays may go to the Gentiles ("the sea").⁴ Here too the Gentiles and the temple are

¹ Cf. T. A. Burkill, "Anti-Semitism in St. Mark's Gospel," *NT* 3 (1959), 34-53.

² It may be that also in Proto-Luke the fig-tree stood for the temple, when we observe that it was planted in the midst of a vineyard = Israel.

³ Evans, "Galilee," and W. Manson, *Jesus the Messiah*, London, 1943, pp. 29f, 39f, want to interpret "this mountain" as the Mount of Olives and to see here a reference to Zech 14:4, where the Mount of Olives is split in two "toward the east and toward the west (רִמְהָ = into the sea)". They overlook the fact that it is the rift which runs east and west, while the two halves of the mountain fall to the north and south.

⁴ So C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, London, 1935, p. 63, but he sees in the sea only destruction. Note that in the Proto-Lucan version of the saying Lk 17:6 it is a poor relative of the fig-tree, the sycamine (= the temple?) which is cast into the sea.

related, just as in the Old Testament vision of the eschatological pilgrimage of the Gentiles to Mount Zion, and if this cannot be, then Zion will go to the Gentiles. This is then Mark's answer to the failure of the mission of the church to Israel and with it the failure of the plan for the inclusion of the Gentiles in the salvation of Israel.

Also the most allegorical of Jesus' parables, that of the wicked tenants, Mk 12:1-9, deals with the question of the destruction of the temple.¹ Lohmeyer² has shown that since the vineyard clearly stands for Israel, the tenants must be those entrusted with the care of God's people, the temple authorities. (If this is true, then the tower in the vineyard may be the temple itself; cf. Enoch 89:73.) The servants will then be the Old Testament prophets sent by God to look for fruit produced by the temple cult but finding none, and Jesus is the son who in fact was killed by the temple authorities. The parable concludes, "What will the owner of the vineyard do? He will come and destroy the tenants and give the vineyard to others." It is common to think of this conclusion as meaning the rejection of Israel and the substitution for it of the church in the plan of God.³ Here it is overlooked that the tenants are the temple authorities and that after their punishment the vineyard is let out to "other tenants who will give him (the owner) the fruits in their seasons." The *care* of Israel will be taken from the temple authorities and given to the church, not salvation or the like. Not only is there no hint of the rejection of Israel, but the parable speaks positively of God's great love for his people that he should entrust it into the hands of better leaders. Why then have interpreters been so misled to come to exactly the opposite conclusion, the rejection of Israel? The answer must lie in the Markan setting. For Mark the destruction of the tenants stands in the immediate future as part of the destruction of the temple, and for him, but not for the parable itself, this means judgment on all Israel. Once more we see how the fate of Jesus and the fate of the temple are intertwined in the Markan passion story.

The great problem in the history of the early church was the

¹ Cf. J. Jeremias, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu*, Göttingen, 1956⁴, p. 145.

² E. Lohmeyer, "Das Gleichnis von den bösen Weingärtnern (Mark. 12, 1-12)," *Urchristliche Mystik*, Darmstadt, 1956, pp. 161-181.

³ So explicitly Jeremias, *Gleichnisse*, p. 59, "Die Bestrafung der Winzer versinnbildlicht die Verwerfung Israels, das 'andere Volk' (Mt. 21, 43) ist die Heidenkirche."

failure of Israel as a whole to respond to the preaching of the gospel. With the non-fulfillment of the expectation of salvation for Israel within a generation all of the promises of the gospel seemed jeopardized. Mark's solution to the problem was the device called messianic secret. It was the will of God according to Is 6:9f that with respect to the secret of the kingdom Israel should "see but not perceive, hear but not understand, lest they should turn again and be forgiven" (4:12). Not just the temple authorities but increasingly Israel itself is presented in the gospel as unbelieving and hostile to the gospel (3:6; 6:6; etc.). It is part of the merit of Schreiber's thought-provoking study¹ to emphasize the hostility to Israel shown in Mark's gospel. This is however not the result of a Hellenistic theology in polemic against Israel and the Jerusalem church, but is the agonizing attempt of a Jewish-Christian to recover from deep disappointment. A more balanced treatment of the theme of the messianic secret as the expression of hostility toward Israel is given by Burkill.² The end result of the misunderstood Messiah is the death of Jesus and judgment on Israel, and the Markan passion story is an attempt to explain both.

Ever since the entry of Jesus into Jerusalem Mark let the storm clouds presaging the death of Jesus and the destruction of the temple gather, until the darkness is almost unrelieved and the tension almost intolerable. Then he seems to spoil all this by inserting a chapter of completely irrelevant teaching, Mark 13, which he would have done better to insert say after chapter 4. Several peculiarities about this chapter have already been noted: we have here a typical farewell discourse, yet one in which the death of the master is never even suggested; we have what appears to be an apocalypse, yet one in which the last judgment is never mentioned. It will be our thesis that all of these problems are related and that Mark 13 is very relevant indeed to its context. Given the pattern we discussed of suffering and vindication based on the Son of Man of Dn 7, the death and resurrection of Jesus so correspond to the

¹ J. Schreiber, "Die Christologie des Markusevangeliums. Beobachtungen zur Theologie und Komposition des zweiten Evangeliums," *ZThK* 58 (1961), 154-183, on which see E. Best, *The Temptation and the Passion*, London, 1966.

² *Mysterious Revelation*, esp. pp. 117-142. Cf. also the important study by J. Gnilka, *Die Verstockung Israels; Isaias 6, 9-10 in der Theologie der Synoptiker*, München, 1961, pp. 23-86.

persecution and exaltation of the church that mention of one can suggest and throw light on the other.

R. H. Lightfoot¹ has pointed out a number of details in which Mk 13 corresponds to the passion story, thus showing that Mark is very consciously paralleling the two. Some are the result of the composition of chapters 14-16 in the light of 13, and some involve slight changes in the tradition behind 13. Thus when it is predicted that the Christians will be delivered to councils and beaten in synagogues and will stand before governors (13:9), we are reminded that Jesus too was delivered up (*παράδιδωμι* appears 10 times in Mk 14f) and was beaten and stood before Pilate. Jesus says Mk 13:23, "Take care! I have told you all beforehand," just as later he foretells the betrayal of Judas (14:20f) and that Peter will deny him (14:30) and all the disciples forsake him (14:27). It was foretold and yet they did not take care. Mk 13:32f says that no one knows that day or that *hour* (as if the particular hour of the end of the world made any difference!), and that therefore the disciples should watch and pray, just as in Gethsemane the disciples were told to watch and pray (14:38); but they slept and unknown to them "the hour has come; the Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of sinners" (14:41; cf. 14:35). The statement that the lord of the house will come at evening (9 PM) or at midnight (12 PM) or at cockcrow (3 AM) or at dawn (6 AM), but in any case at night, seems strange until we recall that Mark partitions the last 24 hours of Jesus' life into three hour intervals (corresponding to the Roman watches) and that every one of these times reappears in the passion story: evening (14:17), midnight (14:41), cockcrow (14:72), and morning (15:1). Finally there is the close correspondence between the parousia of the Son of Man, "they will see the Son of Man coming in clouds with great power and glory" (13:26), and the exaltation of the Son of Man, "you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of Power and coming with the clouds of heaven" (14:62). If in the history of tradition Mk 14:62 is older than 13:26 it is probable that Mark wrote the former in the light of the latter. Here is the most important correspondence of all, for it is because of this already established coordination that Mark can substitute the parousia for

¹ *The Gospel Message of St. Mark*, Oxford, 1950, pp. 48-59; on the importance of Mk 13 for understanding his passion story, cf. also H. W. Bartsch, "Die Bedeutung des Sterbens Jesu nach den Synoptikern," *TZ* 20 (1964), 87-102.

the resurrection in chapter 16. By making use of the light the eschatological discourse and the passion story throw on each other, Mark is able to suggest without explicit mention the judgment in chapter 13 (= Jesus' death) and the resurrection in chapter 16 (= parousia). When he comes to tell the passion story it will be understood against a certain background, which is essential for a full understanding.

Recognition of the correspondence between Mk 13 and the passion story should not detract in the slightest from the apocalyptic expectations of the former. The attempt by Caligula in A.D. 40 to desecrate the temple awoke among Christians as among Jews a new interest in the temple as a sign of the election of Israel. From Antiochos IV to Caligula to Nero, the concept of the Anti-Christ was connected with the desecration of the temple, and this theme too has been included in Mk 13.¹ The conception is similar to that of 2 Thes 2, where the Anti-Christ is connected with the temple, a passage also derived from the Caligula episode.² Mark is however not really interested in the temple as such, nor is he interested in the fate of the city of Jerusalem. We have seen how he has applied to the temple the threat of Jesus that not one stone would be left on another in the city of Jerusalem (13:2). Here however we have not a threat concerning the city addressed to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, but a prediction concerning the temple addressed to Roman Christians. Mark is interested in the destruction of Jerusalem not for its own sake but simply as a chronological sign of the end. He is also not interested in the destruction of the temple as such, but insofar as this is seen to be part of the last judgment he wants to show the parallel to Jesus' death.

The Markan passion story interprets actual historical events as eschatological fulfillment by means of Old Testament scriptures

¹ After the destruction of the temple the Anti-Christ prophecy was no longer really relevant, and though it lived on in apocalyptic circles, in the Johannine epistles it is used characteristically not of the demonic opponent of the end time in the temple but of the heretics of the present in the church: 1 Jn 2:18; 22; 4:1-3; 2 Jn 7.

² Cf. B. W. Bacon, *The Gospel of Mark: Its Date and Composition*, New Haven, 1925. In 2 Cor 12:2 Paul speaks of "a man in Christ who 14 years ago was caught up to the third heaven," a man who was probably Paul himself, who had a revelation 14 years before the date of 2 Corinthians, i.e. in 55-14 = 41, the year of Caligula's death! It seems that not everything which was revealed was ἀρρητὰ, for we learn something of it in 2 Thessalonians.

and Mk 13.¹ For Mark as for John (cf. 3:19; 12:31), the death of Jesus is the last judgment. Thus the darkness over the whole land from the sixth to the ninth hour (Mk 15:33) has nothing to do with an eclipse (it was the time of a full moon!) but comes from Amos 8:9f, "On that day I will make the sun go down at noon (the sixth hour) and darken the land in broad daylight. I will turn your feasts into mourning. . . I will make it like the mourning for an only son," and Mk 13:24, "the sun will be darkened and the moon will not give its light." Jesus' death is parallel to the messianic woes through which the church has been living, and so his death can be seen as the fulfillment of Ps 22 and 69, dealing with the persecuted righteous, and is relevant for the death of the Christian martyrs.² Most interesting however is the connection drawn between the death of Jesus and the destruction of the temple.

Mk 13:26 had said that as soon as the temple is destroyed "they will see the Son of Man coming on clouds with great power and glory." Mk 14:62 says that just after the death of Jesus, "from now on you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of Power and coming with the clouds of heaven," and this is closely connected with the temple saying 14:58, "I will destroy this temple which is made with hands and in three days build another which is not made with hands." While Jesus hung on the cross passersby derided him, saying, "You who destroy and build in three days the temple, save yourself and come down from the cross" (15:29f), whereby again destruction of the temple and death of Jesus are related. Finally, at the climax of the passion story and thus of the whole gospel we read (15:37-39):

And Jesus having uttered a loud cry expired. And the veil of the temple was torn in two from the top to the bottom. And when the centurion who was standing before him saw that he thus expired, he said: Truly this man was the Son of God.

In the Markan context the rending of the temple veil surely refers to the destruction of the whole temple; *velum templi scissum est, velut lamentans excidium loco imminem* (Clem. Rec. I, 41). The original tradition may very well have been, as Lindeskog argues,³

¹ Cf. H. W. Bartsch, "Historische Erwägungen zur Leidensgeschichte," *Evan. Theol.* 22 (1962), 449-459.

² "The Markan passion story is the primitive martyrology," D. W. Riddle, *The Martyrs—A Study in Social Control*, Chicago, 1931, p. 197.

³ G. Lindeskog, "The Veil of the Temple," *Connect. Neotest.* 11 (1947), 132-137; cf. also Taylor, *Mark*, p. 596; Burkill, *Mysterious*, p. 247.

in terms of the cultic significance of Jesus' death, which removes the barrier between God and man and atones for the sins of the world within the Holy of Holies.¹ That there was such a tradition seems to be indicated by Heb 10:19ff. Mark however does not show otherwise any signs of such a cultic interest, and the Jewish-Christian tradition is in terms of an omen of destruction: cf. the passage quoted from the Clementines and the statement in the Gospel according to the Hebrews concerning the fall at the moment of Jesus' death of one of the lintels of the temple, which cannot be separated from the sign of the temple doors opening, Yoma 39b.² Because the destruction of the temple meant for Mark the end of the world, therefore a partial destruction here connects the end with the death of Jesus.³

It is when Jesus "thus" dies, i.e. simultaneously with the rending of the temple veil, that the Gentile centurion expresses the climax of "the gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God" (1:1). Here we see again "the manner in which the temple and the Gentiles come to the front as cognate themes in Mark's narrative of the passion."⁴ The fig-tree is cursed and the temple "cleansed" as a sign of its destruction, but this temple was intended to be a "house of prayer for all nations." The temple made with hands is destroyed, but the temple not made with hands includes the Gentiles. At the end Jesus' enemies will "see" him come for judgment and the persecuted church will "see" him come for their vindication. Here just after the proleptic destruction of the temple the Gentile centurion "sees" that Jesus is the Son of God. The salvation of the Gentiles was to have been an eschatological event, but in Mark's day this eschatology was being realized. Everything points toward the present as the time of the end.

The last words Mark wrote are found Mk 16:8,⁵ but this is not the end of his gospel, for the whole work bears the title: "beginning of

¹ That it was the inner veil which was rent, cf. Billerbeck, *Kommentar* I, 1045; H. Laible (next note), pp. 288-97; Lindeskog, "Veil".

² Cf. H. Laible, "Der zerrissene Tempelvorhang und die eingestürzte Oberschwelle des Tempeleingangs vom Talmud bezeugt," *Neue kirchl. Zeit.* 35 (1924), 287-314.

³ Cf. Lohmeyer, *Markus*, p. 347; M. Goguel, *The Life of Jesus*, New York, 1948, p. 544; S. G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church*, London, 1957², p. 321; Schrenk, *TWNT*, III, 245.

⁴ Evans, "Galilee," p. 15.

⁵ This should be understood as having been firmly established by R. H. Lightfoot, *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels*, pp. 10ff. (London, 1938).

the gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God" (1:1). The ending of the gospel is not yet, but it will be soon. Now the pattern Mark has been establishing of a parallel between Jesus' death and resurrection and the church's suffering and the parousia comes to its fruition. In a story which has its scenery in the finding of the empty tomb, Mark speaks not of the resurrection but of the parousia of Jesus. At the end of his work Mark draws his readers into the story (*tua res agitur*), for they will experience the parousia and that very soon. In the face of such an event the only possible attitude to take is one of *τρόμος καὶ ἔκστασις* and a godly fear.

We can agree then wholeheartedly with Lohmeyer and Lightfoot and Marxsen¹ that Mk 16:7 contains the promise that Jesus' followers will "see" him at the parousia. Not only does this alone do justice to Mk 16:1-8 in its present, presumably complete form, but it fits in with the near expectation we have found in the rest of the gospel. It is however not enough to speak only of the parousia. The promise of 16:7

Go, tell his disciples and Peter that he goes before them into Galilee. There you will see him, as he told you.

cannot be separated from the announcement of 14:27f

All will fall away, as it is written (Zech 13:7), I will strike the shepherd and the sheep will be scattered. But after I am raised up I will go before you into Galilee.

Here the going before must be equivalent to the gathering of the scattered sheep, which implies something else besides the parousia. Furthermore, the element *πρὸ*—"before") in *προάγω* cannot be used in a temporal sense, so that first Jesus would go back to Galilee and then the disciples would come later and see him there, but it must be meant spatially, so that Jesus precedes, leads his disciples to Galilee.² Since resurrection appearances are regularly associated with Jerusalem, and no compelling reason

¹ E. Lohmeyer, *Galiläa und Jerusalem*, Göttingen, 1936, pp. 10-14; Lightfoot, *Locality*, pp. 52ff; W. Marxsen, *Der Evangelist Markus. Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Evangeliums*, Göttingen, 1959², pp. 47-61, 73-77. W. G. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfillment*, London, 1957, pp. 70ff, would like to see Mk 16:1-8 as the promise of a resurrection appearance, but Marxsen has shown how impossible this is.

² Cf. Mk 10:32, "Jesus was leading, going before (*προάγων*) them," and Schmidt, *TWNT*, I, 130.

can be given why the parousia should occur just in Galilee or why the disciples would have to be led to the spot, the expression is rather strange. Accordingly it has been suggested by Boobyer¹ that the reference is to "Galilee of the Gentiles" (Mt 4:15), so that Mark ends with the commandment of the Gentile mission and the promise that Jesus will be active there too. The sense of Mk 16:7 must then be: "he is leading you to the Gentiles; it is there you will behold him."² However just because we have established the relationship of Galilee and Gentiles does not mean that we should overlook the implications of "seeing" Jesus.³ The interpretation of the ending of Mark in terms of a Gentile mission should not be seen as an alternative to the interpretation in terms of the parousia but as a further precision of it. To be sure, Gentile mission and near expectation in fact exclude one another, but Mark was not the only one in the first Christian generation not to realize this. Mark's gospel ends then precisely where the Roman congregation is, engaged in a mission to the Gentiles in spite of persecutions, and he ends with the promise that the parousia will occur very soon, so soon that already now one should stand in fear and wonder in anticipation of it.

Support for this interpretation of Mark can be found in his earliest interpreter, Matthew. Mark had said that the parousia of the Son of Man would occur with the destruction of the Jerusalem temple and that the mission to the Gentiles was an eschatological event associated with the temple. It seems that Matthew has agreed with him and said that indeed the parousia occurred while the temple was in flames.

Mt 24 follows the outline of Mk 13 very closely, with only the addition of more apocalyptic elements derived from the Old Testament. Two of these additions are very interesting. Mk 13:24 says "in those days, after that tribulation," viz. the fall of the temple, the Son of Man would come on the clouds of heaven. Matthew,

¹ G. H. Boobyer, "Galilee and Galileans in St. Mark's Gospel," *Bull. Jn. Ryl. Lib.* 35 (1952-53), 334-348. He has been followed by Evans, "Galilee", and Schreiber, "Christologie". Lightfoot changed his earlier position and adopted this one, *Gospel Message*, pp. 106-116.

² Evans, "Galilee," p. 18.

³ It seems that Evans may be thinking of something like the vision Paul had when he was called as Apostle to the Gentiles, as is explicitly stated by T. W. Manson, *The Servant Messiah*, Cambridge, r.p. 1961, p. 97.

writing after A.D. 70,¹ very strangely adds the word ἐπὶθῶς; "immediately after the tribulation of those days..." (24:29). Since Matthew understands the tribulation as does Mark to be the fall of the "holy place" (24:15), this must mean that for him the Son of Man really came on the clouds in A.D. 70. This is the thesis of A. Feuillet,² and with respect to the gospel of Matthew only³ we must agree with him. Mt 23 is the denunciation of the Pharisees of the generation before 70, Mt 24 concerns their punishment in the fall of Jerusalem, and only Mt 25 is about the end of the world. There is support for this interpretation in another addition Mt 24:30, "then will appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven and all the tribes of the land will beat their breasts and they will see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory."⁴ In accordance with the understanding of the ancient church⁵ we should see in this sign an appearance of a cross in the heavens. "The sign of the Son of Man, then, is an enigmatic allusion to the cross, a phenomenon or portent in the sky, which will cause the tribes of the earth to mourn because it is the premonitory sign of the advent of the Son of Man, the judge."⁶ It is very interesting

¹ Mt 22:7 is a sure indication of a post-70 date. Even if the destruction of a city may be a standard topos (K. H. Rengstorff, "Die Stadt der Mörder (Mt 22:7)," *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche*, Berlin, 1960, pp. 106-129), it has clearly been inserted here in the light of the fall of Jerusalem; cf. S. Pedersen, "Zum Problem der vaticinia ex eventu. Eine Analyse von Mt. 21, 33-46par.; 22,1-10par," *Stud. Theol.* 19 (1965), 167-188.

² A. Feuillet, "La synthèse eschatologique de saint Matthieu," *Rev. Bib.* 56-57 (1949-50), 340-364, 62-91, 180-211; "Le sens du mot parousie dans l'évangile de Matthieu," *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*, London, 1956, pp. 261-280.

³ We explicitly distance ourselves from his thesis with regard to Mark, to say nothing of Jesus, as it is contained in "Le discours de Jésus sur la ruine du temple d'après Marc XIII et Luc XXI, 2-36," *Rev. Bib.* 55-56 (1948-49), 481-502, 61-92. The book with the promising title by F. Spadafora, *Gesù e la Fine di Gerusalemme*, Rovigo, 1950, is little more than an expansion of Feuillet's thesis.

⁴ The reference is to Zech 12:10, in connection with the siege of Jerusalem by the nations. There God intervenes on the side of Jerusalem, but this has been reversed in Matthew's understanding in the light of the outcome of the war in A.D. 70.

⁵ Cf. Did. 16:6; Evan. Pet. 10:39-42; Apok. Pet. 1; Sib. IV, 172; V, 158; VI, 26-28, etc.

⁶ A. J. B. Higgins, "The Sign of the Son of Man (Matt. xxiv 30)," *NTS* 9 (1963), 380-382, p. 382; cf. Lindars, *Apologetic*, p. 126. T. F. Glasson, "The Ensign of the Son of Man (Matt. xxiv-30)," *JThSt* 15 (1964), 299-300, emphasizes the gathering of the people of God, which was for Matthew the Gentile mission beginning in A.D. 70; cf. below on Mt 28.

that Josephus says that just before the fall of the temple "a star appeared over the city in the shape of a sword (ῥομφαία παραπλήσιον)" (B.J. VI, 289). Whatever the astronomical phenomenon may have been, or even if it was only a popular legend, what would appear to Josephus to look like a sword would have for Matthew the shape of a cross. The sign of the Son of Man did appear over Jerusalem then at the time of its destruction. Matthew does not say that the destruction was the work of the Son of Man, but this is at least conceivable in his theology.

Finally there is the ending of Matthew's gospel, which is usually understood as the account of a resurrection appearance in Galilee. But quite aside from the fact that resurrection appearances are otherwise associated with Jerusalem, there are other difficulties in this understanding. We have already noted how closely the scene is patterned after the eschatological coming of the Son of Man to God Dn 7:13f.¹ "It is hardly adequate to call Mt 28:16-20 a resurrection appearance; it is rather a stupendous Christophany which proclaims the universal mission of the church, and the abiding presence with the church on earth of the universal Lord until the parousia."² But why say "until the parousia" when Matthew says "until the end of the age"? It was a sure instinct which led Lightfoot to speak of the story as "a kind of proleptic parousia", but again, why "proleptic"? The Gospel according to Mark ends with the promise that the parousia will occur as soon as the temple is destroyed, and this is associated with a mission to the Gentiles in "Galilee". Why should not Matthew have simply believed him, and said that in fact the parousia did occur in A.D. 70 in Galilee!³

It is to be noted that there are no chronological indications connected with the passage Mt 28:16-20 at all. Indeed Matthew is not particularly interested in history and chronology at all but rather with Heilsgeschichte. We have seen how as a reaction to the great crisis in the history of the early church there was a division set at different times by different people into two periods: the time of

¹ "Die Beziehung des Vollmachtwortes v. 18 zu Dan 7,14 gehört heute zum Gemeingut der Exegese," W. Trilling, *Das wahre Israel; Studien zur Theologie des Matthäusevangeliums*, Leipzig, 1959, p. 6.

² Evans, "Galilee," p. 12. O. Michel, "Menschensohn und Völkerwelt," *EMZ* 2 (1941), 257-267, p. 262, speaks similarly of "Geschichte gewordene Eschatologie."

³ We recall the Rabbinic tradition which said that if the Messiah was supposed to come on 9 Ab 68 then he *did* come on that date.

mission to Israel and the time of mission to the Gentiles. Matthew is clearly in the latter period, but as a successor to the Jerusalem church he could very well have set the transition point as late as A.D. 70.¹ This would account for the contradiction between Mt 10 and Mt 28. Mt 10 refers to the period of mission to Israel, a period which is brought to an end by the coming of the Son of Man (10:23). This coming of the Son of Man is described in Mt 28 and occurred with the fall of the temple.² In all of this Matthew has the advantage of being faithful to his predecessor Mark and of solving at the same time the problems of both eschatology and the Gentile mission.³ He did not realize the great calamity his solution would later cause.

If Matthew has taken over from Mark the idea that the parousia of Jesus and the transition to the Gentile mission occurred in A.D. 70, he has also taken over Mark's association of the fall of Jerusalem with the last judgment and with the death of Jesus. Even this must have seemed to him an advantage, for it provided him with an answer to the burning question within Israel: how could God have allowed the destruction of the temple and so many of his people? Thus when Matthew wrote down the horrible cry, "His blood be on us and on our children", far from being an incitement to persecution, it was an attempt to explain all the blood which had already been shed in the catastrophe of 66-70. The same is to be said for the bitterness of the condemnation of the Pharisees Mt 23, for this chapter has been closely connected to Mt 24 in an attempt to explain the reason behind the horrors of the recent war. The introduction to the whole eschatological discourse is the statement: "Amen, I tell you, all this will come on this generation" (23:36). As Hummel says, "Matthäus deutet also die Tempelzerstörung durch die Pharisäerrede. Und umgekehrt: Die Pharisäerrede kann nur recht verstanden werden, wenn erkannt ist, dass sie auf die Tempelzerstörung hinzielt. Historisch gesprochen: Der Hintergrund von

¹ Note that also the Clementines, Rec. I, 64, sets the transition point to Gentile mission in A.D. 70.

² Cf. A. Feuillet, "Les Origines et la Signification de Mt 10, 23b," *Cath. Bib. Quart.* 23 (1961), 182-198; and Moule, *Birth*, p. 90.

³ It is interesting that Matthew should have in a sense a modern successor in W. G. Kümmel, "Jesus und die Anfänge der Kirche," *Stud. Theol.* 7 (1953), 1-27, p. 9, who agrees that the church is the new temple not made with hands, but says that this can come to pass only after the destruction of the old temple and the parousia of Jesus.

Mt 23 ist die Katastrophe des Jahres 70." ¹ We cannot go further into this theme of judgment on Israel in Matthew but must refer to the excellent studies of Hummel and Trilling.²

In conclusion then we can see where two tragic mistakes were made in connection with the eschatological expectation of the early church. The first occurred when the threat of judgment on Israel became under the pressure of persecution a prediction or even a hope for vengeance. The second occurred when Mark expected the end to come in connection with the fall of Jerusalem and this expectation was seen to be fulfilled by Matthew as a judgment against Israel. Very much against his own intention, then, Matthew became one of the principle sources of the persecution of Israel, which has haunted the history of the church down to our own day.

¹ R. Hummel, *Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum im Matthäusevangelium*, München, 1963, p. 87.

² Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*; Trilling, *Wahre Israel*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aalen, S., "'Reign' and 'House' in the Kingdom of God in the Gospels," *NTS* 8 (1962), 215-240.
- Abelson, J., *The Immanence of God in Rabbinic Literature*, London, 1912.
- Abrahams, I., *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, First and Second Series, Cambridge, 1917, 1924.
- Albertz, M., *Die synoptische Streitgespräche: ein Beitrag zur Formgeschichte des Urchristentums*, Berlin, 1921.
- Alizon, J., *Étude sur le prophétisme chrétien depuis les origines jusqu'à l'an 150*, Cahors et Alençon, 1911.
- Allegro, J. M., *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, Baltimore, 1956.
- "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," *JBL* 75 (1956), 174-187.
- Allen, R., *Missionary Methods, St. Paul's or Ours*, London, 1912.
- Allo, E. B., "La portée de la collecte pour Jérusalem dans les plans de Saint Paul," *RB* 45 (1936), 529-537.
- Ante-Nicene Fathers, The*, Vol. I-X, r.p. Grand Rapids, 1956.
- Bacon, B. W., "Pharisees and Herodians in Mark," *JBL* 39 (1920), 102-112.
- "Wrath 'unto the Uttermost,'" *Expositor* 24 (1922), 356-376.
- *The Gospel of Mark: Its Date and Composition*, New Haven, 1925.
- *Studies in Matthew*, New York, 1930.
- Baeck, Leo, *The Pharisees and Other Essays*, New York, 1947.
- "The Gospel as a Document of the History of the Jewish Faith," *Judaism and Christianity*, Philadelphia, 1958, pp. 41-136.
- Baillet, M., "Fragments araméens de Qumrân 2. Description de la Jérusalem nouvelle," *RB* 62 (1955), 222-245.
- Baltzer, K., "The Meaning of the Temple in the Lukan Writings," *HTR* 58 (1965), 263-277.
- Bammel, E., "Judenverfolgung und Naherwartung. Zur Eschatologie des Ersten Thessalonicherbriefs," *ZThK* 56 (1959), 294-315.
- "Matthäus 10,23," *Stud. Theol.* 15 (1961), 79-92.
- Bardtke, H., *Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer*, Vol. I-II, Berlin, 1953, 1958.
- Barnard, L. W., "Saint Stephen and Early Alexandrian Christianity," *NTS* 7 (1960), 31-45.
- "The Testimonium concerning the Stone in the New Testament and in the Epistle of Barnabas," *Studia Evangelica* III (T.U. 80), Berlin, 1964, pp. 306-313.
- Baron, S. W., *A Social and Religious History of the Jews: Vol. I-II, Ancient Times*, Philadelphia, 1952².
- Barrett, C. K., *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*, London, 1966².
- "Paul and the 'Pillar' Apostles," *Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan*, Haarlem, 1953, pp. 1-19.
- *The Gospel according to St. John*, London, 1955.
- "The Background of Mark 10:45," *New Testament Essays. Studies in Memory of T.W. Manson*, ed. A.J.B. Higgins, Manchester, 1959, pp. 1-18.
- Barth, K., *Kirchliche Dogmatik*, IV, 2, Zürich, 1955.
- Barth, M., *Der Augenzeuge. Eine Untersuchung über die Wahrnehmung des Menschensohnes durch die Apostel*, Zürich, 1946.

- Bartsch, H.-W., "Historische Erwägungen zur Leidensgeschichte," *Evan. Theol.* 22 (1962), 449-459.
- "Die Bedeutung des Sterbens Jesu nach den Synoptikern," *TZ* 20 (1964), 87-102.
- "Die Argumentation des Paulus in 1 Cor 15:3-11," *ZNW* 55 (1964), 261-274.
- "Early Christian Eschatology in the Synoptic Gospels (A Contribution to Form-critical Research)," *NTS* 11 (1965), 387-397.
- Bauer, W., *Das Johannesevangelium*, Tübingen, 1933².
- Baumgarten, J. M., "Sacrifice and Worship among the Jewish Sectarials of the Dead Sea (Qumrân) Scrolls," *HTR* 46 (1953), 141-159.
- Beare, F. W., *The First Epistle of Peter*, Oxford, 1958².
- *The Earliest Records of Jesus*, Nashville, 1962.
- Beasley-Murray, G. R., *Jesus and the Future: An Examination of the Eschatological Discourse, Mark 13, with Special Reference to the Little Apocalypse Theory*, London, 1954.
- *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen*, London, 1957.
- Benoit, P., "L'Enfance de Jean-Baptiste selon Luc 1," *NTS* 3 (1957), 169-194.
- , Milik, J. T., de Vaux, R., *Discoveries in the Judean Desert: II. Les Grottes de Murabâ'ât*, Oxford, 1961.
- Bentzen, A., *Daniel*, Tübingen, 1937.
- *Messias—Moses redivivus—Menschensohn*, Zürich, 1948.
- Best, E., *One Body in Christ: A Study in the Relationship of the Church to Christ in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul*, London, 1955.
- *The Temptation and the Passion*, London, 1966.
- Betz, O., "Felsenmann und Felsengemeinde (Eine Parallele zu Mt 16.17-19 in den Qumranpsalmen)," *ZNW* 48 (1957), 49-77.
- "Jesu Heiliger Krieg," *NT* 2 (1957), 208-223.
- *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte*, Tübingen, 1960.
- "Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein Jesu," *NT* 6 (1963), 20-48.
- "The Dichotomized Servant and the End of Judas Iscariot (Light on the Dark Passages: Matthew 24,51 and parallel; Acts 1, 18)," *Rev. Qum.* 5 (1964), 43-58.
- Bickermann, E., *Der Gott der Makkabäer*, Berlin, 1937.
- "The Warning Inscription of Herod's Temple," *JQR* 37 (1946-47), 387-405.
- Billerbeck, P. (and Strack, H. L.), *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, Vol. 1-4, München, 1922-28.
- Black, M., *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, Oxford, 1954².
- "The Gospels and the Scrolls," *Studia Evangelica* I (T.U. 73), Berlin, 1959, pp. 565-579.
- *The Scrolls and Christian Origins; Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament*, London, 1961.
- "The Son of Man Problem in Recent Research and Debate," *Bull. Jn. Ryl. Lib.* 45 (1963), 305-318.
- Blass, F. (bearbeitet von Debrunner, A.), *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, Göttingen, 1954⁹.
- Blinzler, J., "Die literarische Eigenart des sogenannten Reiseberichtes im Lukas-Evangelium," *Synoptische Studien A. Wikenhauser dargebracht*, München, 1953, pp. 20-52.
- *Der Prozess Jesu: das jüdische und das römische Gerichtsverfahren gegen Jesus Christus auf Grund der ältesten Zeugnisse*, Regensburg, 1955².

- Bloch, Ph., "Studien zur Aggadah," *Monatschrift für Gesch. und Wissen. des Judenthums* 34 (1884), 264-269, 385-392.
- Bonnard, P., *Jésus-Christ édifiant son Église; Le concept d'édification dans le Nouveau Testament*, Neuchâtel, 1948.
- Bonsirven, J., *Le Judaïsme palestinien au temps de Jésus-Christ*, Vol. I-II, Paris, 1934-35.
- Boobyer, G. H., *St. Mark and the Transfiguration Story*, Edinburgh, 1942.
- "Galilee and Galileans in St. Mark's Gospel," *Bull. Jn. Ryl. Lib.* 35 (1952-53), 334-348.
- Bornemann, W., "Der erste Petrusbrief—eine Taufrede des Silvanus?," *ZNW* 19 (1920), 143-165.
- Bornhäuser, K., *Das Wirken des Christus durch Taten und Worte*, Gütersloh, 1921.
- *Studien zum Sondergut des Lukas*, Gütersloh, 1934.
- Bornkamm, G., "Die Verzögerung der Parousie," In *Memoriam Ernst Lohmeyer*, ed. W. Schmauch, Stuttgart, 1951, pp. 116-126.
- "Das Doppelgebot der Liebe," *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann*, Berlin, 1954, pp. 85-93.
- *Jesus von Nazareth*, Stuttgart, 1956.
- , Barth, G., Held, H. J., *Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäus-Evangelium*, Neukirchen, 1960.
- Bosch, D., *Die Heidenmission in der Zukunftsschau Jesu; Eine Untersuchung zur Eschatologie der synoptischen Evangelien*, Zürich, 1959.
- Bousset, W., *Der Antichrist in der Überlieferung des Judentums, des Neuen Testaments und der alten Kirche*, Göttingen, 1895.
- "Wellhausens Evangelienkritik," *Theol. Rund.* 9 (1906), 1-14, 43-51.
- *Kyrios Christos*, Göttingen, 1921².
- *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*, ed. H. Gressmann, Tübingen, 1926³.
- Bowman, J., "Early Samaritan Eschatology," *Journ. of Jew. Stud.* 6 (1955), 63-72.
- "Contact between Samaritan Sects and Qumran?," *VT* 7 (1957), 184-189.
- "Did the Qumran Sect Burn the Red Heifer?," *Rev. Qum.* 1 (1958), 73-84.
- Bowman, J. W., *The Religion of Maturity*, Nashville, 1948.
- Box, G. H., "The Gospel Narratives of the Nativity and the Alleged Influence of Heathen Ideas," *ZNW* 6 (1905), 80-101.
- Brandon, S. G. F., *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church*, London, 1957².
- "The Date of the Markan Gospel," *NTS* 7 (1961), 126-141.
- Brandt, W., *Die jüdischen Baptismen*, Berlin, 1910.
- Branscomb, B. H., *Jesus and the Law of Moses*, New York, 1930.
- *The Teachings of Jesus*, New York, 1931.
- Braumann, G., "Die lukanische Interpretation der Zerstörung Jerusalems," *NT* 6 (1963), 120-127.
- Braun, F. M., "In spiritu et veritate," *Rev. Thom.* 52 (1952), 245-274.
- "Le Mandéisme et la Secte essénienne de Qumrân," *L'Ancien Testament et l'Orient*, Louvain, 1957, pp. 193-230.
- "Saint Jean, la Sagesse et l'histoire," *Neotestamentica et Patristica*, Leiden, 1962, pp. 123-133.
- Braun, H., "Der Sinn der neutestamentlichen Christologie," *Gesammelte Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt*, Tübingen, 1962, pp. 243-282.

- Brown, J. R., *Temple and Sacrifice in Rabbinic Judaism*, Evanston, 1964.
- Brown, R. E., *The Gospel according to John (I-XII)*, New York, 1966.
- Brownlee, H. W., "The Jerusalem Habakkuk Scroll," *BASOR* 112 (1948), 8-18.
- "The Servant of the Lord in the Qumran Scrolls," *BASOR* 132 (1953), 8-15; 135 (1954), 33-38.
- "John the Baptist in the Light of Ancient Scrolls," *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. K. Stendahl, New York, 1957, pp. 33-53.
- Bruce, F. F., *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*, den Haag, 1959.
- "The Book of Zechariah and the Passion Narrative," *Bull. Jn. Ryl. Lib.* 43 (1961), 336-353.
- "Josephus and Daniel," *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* IV, Leiden, 1965, pp. 148-162.
- Buchanan, G. W., "Mark 11.15-19: Brigands in the Temple," *H.U.C.A.* 30 (1959), 169-177.
- Büchler, A., *Das Synedrion in Jerusalem und das grosse Beth-Din in der Quadderkammer des jerusalemischen Tempels*, Wien, 1902.
- "The New 'Fragment of an Uncanonical Gospel,'" *JQR* 20 (1908), 330-346.
- "Learning and Teaching in the Open Air in Palestine," *JQR* n.s. 4 (1914), 485-491.
- *Studies in Sin and Atonement in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century*, Oxford, 1928.
- Büchsel, F., *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, Göttingen, 1934.
- Bultmann, R., "Die Frage nach der Echtheit von Mt. 16, 17-19," *Th. Bl.* 20 (1941), 265-279.
- *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, Tübingen, 1954².
- *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, with *Ergänzungsheft*, Göttingen, 1958⁴.
- *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, Göttingen, 1959¹⁶.
- "Zur Frage nach den Quellen der Apostelgeschichte," *New Testament Essays; Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson*, ed. A. J. B. Higgins, Manchester, 1959, pp. 68-80.
- Burch, V., "The 'Stone' and the 'Keys' (Mt 16:18ff)," *JBL* 52 (1933), 147-152.
- Burkill, T. A., "St. Mark's Philosophy of the Passion," *NT* 2 (1958), 245-271.
- "Anti-Semitism in St. Mark's Gospel," *NT* 3 (1959), 34-53.
- *Mysterious Revelation; An Examination of St. Mark's Gospel*, Ithaca, 1963.
- Burney, C. F., *The Poetry of Our Lord*, Oxford, 1925.
- Burrows, E., *The Gospel of the Infancy*, London, 1940.
- Burton, E. D., *Some Principles of Literary Criticism and their Application to the Synoptic Problem*, Chicago, 1904.
- Busch, F., *Zum Verständnis der synoptischen Eschatologie; Markus 13 neu untersucht*, Gütersloh, 1938.
- Cadbury, H. J., *The Peril of Modernizing Jesus*, New York, 1937.
- Cadoux, C. J., *The Historic Mission of Jesus: A Constructive Re-examination of the Eschatological Teaching in the Synoptic Gospels*, London, 1941.
- Caird, G. B., *Saint Luke*, Baltimore, 1963.
- *The Revelation of St. John the Divine*, New York, 1966.
- Carmignac, J., "L'utilité ou l'inutilité des sacrifices sanglants dans la 'Règle de la Communauté,'" *Rev. Bib.* 63 (1956), 524-532.

- Carrington, P., *The Primitive Christian Catechism*, Cambridge, 1940.
- Causse, A., "Le mythe de la nouvelle Jérusalem du Deutéro-Isaïe à la IIIe Sibylle," *Rev. d'Hist. et de Phil. Rel.* 18 (1938), 377-414.
- Chamberlain, J. V., "Toward a Qumran Soteriology," *NT* 3 (1959), 305-313.
- Charles, R. H., ed., *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, Vol. I-II, Oxford, 1913.
- *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John*, Vol. I-II, Edinburgh, 1920.
- Clark, K. W., "Worship in the Jerusalem Temple after A.D. 70," *NTS* 6 (1960), 269-280.
- Clements, R. E., *God and Temple*, Philadelphia, 1965.
- Coates, J. R., *The Christ of Revolution*, London, 1920.
- Cole, A., *The New Temple: A Study in the Origin of the Catechetical "Form" of the Church in the New Testament*, London, 1951.
- Comblin, J., "La paix dans la théologie de saint Luc," *Eph. Theol. Lovan.* 32 (1956), 439-460.
- Congar, Y. M. J., *Le mystère du temple; ou l'économie de la Présence de Dieu à sa créature, de la Genèse à l'Apocalypse*, Paris, 1958.
- Conzelmann, H., "Gegenwart und Zukunft in der synoptischen Tradition," *ZThK* 54 (1957), 277-296.
- "Geschichte und Eschaton nach Mc 13," *ZNW* 50 (1959), 210-221.
- *Die Mitte der Zeit; Studien zur Theologie des Lukas*, Tübingen, 1960².
- Creed, J. M., *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, London, 1930.
- Cross, F. L., *I Peter: A Paschal Liturgy*, London, 1954.
- Cross, F. M., Jr., *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*, New York, 1961.
- Cullmann, O., *Le problème littéraire et historique du roman pseudo-clémentin*, Paris, 1930.
- "Eschatologie und Mission im Neuen Testament," *EMM* 85 (1941), 98-108.
- "Der johanneische Gebrauch doppeldeutiger Ausdrücke als Schlüssel zum Verständnis des vierten Evangeliums," *ThZ* 4 (1948), 360-372.
- *Die ersten christlichen Glaubensbekenntnisse*, Zürich, 1949².
- *Urchristenheit und Gottesdienst*, Zürich, 1950.
- *Petrus, Jünger—Apostel—Märtyrer*, Zürich, 1952.
- "Die neuentdeckten Qumrantexte und das Judenchristentum der Pseudoklementinen," *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann*, Berlin, 1954, pp. 35-51.
- "Samaria and the Origins of the Christian Mission. Who are the AAAOI of John 4, 38?," *The Early Church*, London, 1956, pp. 185-193.
- *Der Staat im Neuen Testament*, Tübingen, 1956.
- *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments*, Tübingen, 1957.
- "Secte de Qumran, hellénistes des Actes et Quatrième Évangile," *Les Manuscrits de la mer Morte*, Paris, 1957, pp. 61-74.
- "Que signifie le sel dans la parabole de Jésus?," *Rev. d'Hist. et de Phil. Rel.* 37 (1957), 36-43.
- "Parousieverzögerung und Urchristentum. Der gegenwärtige Stand der Diskussion," *ThLZ* 83 (1958), 1-12.
- "L'apôtre Pierre instrument du diable et instrument de Dieu," *New Testament Essays; Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson*, ed. A. J. B. Higgins, Manchester, 1959, pp. 94-105.
- "L'opposition contre le temple de Jérusalem, motif commun de la théologie johannique et du monde ambiant," *NTS* 5 (1959), 157-173.

- Cullmann, O., "Das Thomasevangelium und die Frage nach dem Alter der in ihm enthaltenen Tradition," *ThLZ* 85 (1960), 321-334.
- Dabeck, P., "Siehe, Es erschienen Moses und Elias," *Biblica* 23 (1942), 175-189.
- Dahl, N. A., *Das Volk Gottes. Eine Untersuchung zum Kirchenbewusstsein des Urchristentums*, Oslo, 1941.
- "The Parables of Growth," *St. Th.* 5 (1951), 132-166.
- "Adresse und Prooemium des Epheserbriefs," *ThZ* 7 (1951), 241-264.
- "The Origin of Baptism," *Norsk Theol. Tid.* 56 (1955), 36-52.
- "'A People for His Name' (Acts xv. 14)," *NTS* 4 (1957-58), 319-327.
- "Der gekreuzigte Messias," *Der historische Jesus und der kerygmatische Christus*, ed. Ristow and Matthiae, Berlin, 1962, pp. 149-169.
- Dalman, G., *Der leidende und sterbende Messias der Synagoge im ersten nachchristlichen Jahrhundert*, Berlin, 1888.
- *Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch*, Leipzig, 1905².
- *Aramäische Dialektproben*, Leipzig, 1927².
- *Die Worte Jesu*, Leipzig, 1930².
- Dane'l, G. A., "The Idea of God's People in the Bible," *The Root of the Vine*, London, 1953, pp. 23-36.
- Daube, D., *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, London, 1956.
- Davies, W. D., *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism; Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*, London, 1955².
- *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*, Cambridge, 1964.
- Delcor, M., "Le sacerdoce, les lieux de culte, les rites et les fêtes dans les documents de Khirbet Qumrân," *Rev. d'Hist. des Rel.* 144 (1953), 5-41.
- Delling, G., *Der Gottesdienst im Neuen Testament*, Göttingen, 1952.
- Dibelius, M., *Der Hirt des Hermas* (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, Ergänzungsband: Die Apostolischen Väter, pp. 415-644), Tübingen, 1923.
- *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur*, Berlin, 1926.
- *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, Tübingen, 1933² = *From Tradition to Gospel*, London, 1934.
- *Botschaft und Geschichte: Gesammelte Aufsätze*, Bd. I, *Zur Evangelienforschung*, ed. G. Bornkamm, Tübingen, 1953.
- "The Conversion of Cornelius," *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, London, 1956, pp. 109-122.
- *Der Brief des Jakobus*, Göttingen, 1957⁹.
- Dickey, S., *The Constructive Revolution of Jesus; A Study of Some of His Social Attitudes*, New York, n.d. (1923).
- Dobschütz, E. von, "Zur Erzählungskunst des Markus," *ZNW* 27 (1928), 193-198.
- Dodd, C. H., "Jesus als Lehrer und Prophet," *Mysterium Christi*, ed. Bell and Deissmann, London, 1930, pp. 56-66.
- *The Parables of the Kingdom*, London, 1935.
- *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*, London, 1936.
- "The Fall of Jerusalem and the 'Abomination of Desolation,'" *Journ. of Rom. Stud.* 37 (1947), 47-54.
- *According to the Scriptures; The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology*, London, 1952.
- *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge, 1953.
- "The Primitive Catechism and the Sayings of Jesus," *New Testament Essays; Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson*, ed. A. J. B. Higgins, Manchester, 1959, pp. 106-118.

- "The Prophecy of Caiaphas John X, 47-53," *Neotestamentica et Patristica*, Leiden, 1962, pp. 134-143.
- *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge, 1963.
- Review of W. D. Davies, *Invitation to the New Testament*, *Union Sem. Quart. Rev.* 21 (1966), 474-476.
- Doeve, J. W., *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*, Assen, 1954.
- Dornseiff, F., "Zum Testimonium Flavianum," *ZNW* 46 (1955), 245-250.
- Downing, J., "Jesus and Martyrdom," *JThSt* 14 (1963), 279-293.
- Dubarle, A. M., "Le Signe du Temple (Jo ii, 19)," *Rev. Bib.* 48 (1939), 21-44.
- Dunkerley, R., *The Hope of Jesus; A Study in Moral Eschatology*, London, 1953.
- Duplacy, J., "A propos d'une variante 'occidentale' des Actes des Apôtres (III, 11)," *Rev. des études augustinienues* 2 (1956), 231-242.
- Dupont, J., "'Vous n'aurez pas achevé les villes d'Israël avant que le Fils de l'homme ne vienne' (Mat. X, 23)," *NT* 2 (1958), 228-244.
- Dupont-Sommer, A., *Nouveaux Aperçus sur les manuscrits de la mer Morte*, Paris, 1953.
- *The Essene Writings from Qumran*, New York, 1961.
- Easton, B. S., "Linguistic Evidence for the Lucan Source L," *JBL* 29 (1910), 139-180.
- "The Special Source of the Third Gospel," *JBL* 30 (1911), 78-103.
- *The Gospel according to St. Luke; A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, Edinburgh, 1926.
- Ebeling, H. J., "Die Fastenfrage (Mark 2.18-22)," *Theol. Stud. und Krit.* 108 (1937-38), 387-397.
- Edlund, C., *Das Auge der Einfalt*, Uppsala, 1952.
- Edsman, C. M., *Le Baptême de feu*, Leipzig, 1940.
- Ehrhardt, A. A. T., *The Apostolic Succession*, London, 1953.
- "The Birth of the Synagogue and R. Akiba," *Stud. Theol.* 9 (1955), 86-111.
- Eisler, R., Ἰησοῦς βασιλεὺς οὐ βασιλεύσας Vol. I-II, Heidelberg, 1929-30.
- Elliger, K., *Studien zum Habakuk Kommentar vom Toten Meer*, Tübingen, 1953.
- Ellis, E. E., "II Corinthians v. 1-10 in Pauline Eschatology," *NTS* 6 (1960), 211-224.
- "Luke xi. 49-51: An Oracle of a Christian Prophet?," *Exp. Times* 74 (1963), 157-158.
- Emerton, J. A., "Binding and Loosing — Forgiving and Retaining," *JThSt* 13 (1962), 325-331.
- Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History*, trans. K. Lake and J. E. L. Oulton, Vol. I-II, London, 1926, 1932.
- Evans, C. F., "I will go before you into Galilee," *JThSt* 5 (1954), 3-18.
- "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel," *Studies in the Gospels*, ed. D. E. Nineham, Oxford, 1955, pp. 37-53.
- Farmer, W. R., *Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus: An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period*, New York, 1956.
- Fascher, E., "Jerusalems Untergang in der urchristlichen und altkirchlichen Überlieferung," *ThLZ* 89 (1964), 81-98.
- Feine, P., *Eine vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas*, Gotha, 1891.

- Feuillet, A., "Le discours de Jésus sur la ruine du temple d'après Marc XIII et Luc XXI, 2-36," *Rev. Bib.* 55 (1948), 481-502; 56 (1949), 61-92.
- "La synthèse eschatologique de saint Matthieu," *Rev. Bib.* 56 (1949), 340-364; 57 (1950), 62-91, 180-211.
- "Le Fils de l'homme de Daniel et la tradition biblique," *Rev. Bib.* 60 (1953), 170-202, 321-346.
- "Le sens du mot parousie dans l'évangile de Matthieu," *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*, London, 1956, pp. 261-280.
- "Les origines et la signification de Mt. 10, 23b," *Cath. Bib. Quart.* 23 (1961), 182-198.
- Fiebig, P., *Jüdische Wundergeschichten des neutestamentlichen Zeitalters unter besonderer Berücksichtigung ihres Verhältnisses zum Neuen Testament*, Tübingen, 1911.
- Filson, F. V., *A New Testament History*, Philadelphia, 1964.
- Finkelstein, L., *Akiba, Scholar, Saint and Martyr*, Philadelphia, 1936.
- *The Pharisees; The Sociological Background of their Faith*, Vol. I-II, Philadelphia, 1962².
- Fischel, H. A., "Prophet and Martyr," *JQR* 37 (1946-47), 265-280, 363-386.
- Fitzmyer, J. A., "The Qumran Scrolls, the Ebionites, and their Literature," *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. K. Stendahl, New York, 1957, pp. 208-231.
- "'4Q Testimonia' and the New Testament," *Th. Stud.* 18 (1957), 513-537.
- "Qumran and the Interpolated Paragraph in 2 Cor 6,14-7,1," *Cath. Bib. Quart.* 23 (1961), 271-280.
- Flender, H., *Heil und Geschichte in der Theologie des Lukas*, München, 1965.
- Flew, R. N., *Jesus and His Church; A Study of the Idea of the Ecclesia in the New Testament*, London, 1938.
- Flusser, D., "The Dead Sea Sect and pre-Pauline Christianity," *Scripta Hierosolymitana IV*, Jerusalem, 1958, pp. 215-266.
- "Two Notes on the Midrash on 2 Sam. VII," *Isr. Explor. Journ.* 9 (1959), 99-109.
- Foakes-Jackson, F. J. and Lake, K., *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Vol. I-V, London, 1920-1933.
- Foerster, W., "Stephanus und die Urgemeinde," *Dienst unter dem Wort; eine Festgabe für Prof. D. Dr. Helmut Schreiner*, Gütersloh, 1953, pp. 1-30.
- Ford, J. M., "'Thou Art 'Abraham' and Upon This Rock . . .," *Heyth. Journ.* 6 (1965), 289-301.
- Fraeyman, M., "La Spiritualisation de l'idée du temple dans les épîtres pauliniennes," *Ephem. Theol. Lovan.* 33 (1947), 378-412.
- Fraidl, F., *Die Exegese der siebenzig Wochen Daniels*, Graz, 1883.
- Freytag, W., "Mission im Blick aufs Ende," *EMZ* 3 (1942), 321-333.
- Fridrichsen, A., "Le péché contre le Saint-Esprit," *Rev. de l'Hist. et de Phil. Rel.* 3 (1923), 367-372.
- "Bemerkungen zur Fusswaschung Joh 13," *ZNW* 38 (1939), 94-96.
- "Themelios, 1 Kor 3,11," *ThZ* 2 (1946), 316-317.
- Friedrich, G., "Beobachtungen zur messianischen Hohepriestererwartung in den Synoptikern," *ZThK* 53 (1956), 265-311.
- Fritsch, C. T., *The Qumran Community*, New York, 1956.
- Fuchs, E., *Studies of the Historical Jesus*, London, 1964.
- Fuller, R. H., *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus*, London, 1954.

- Gärtner, B., *The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation*, Uppsala, 1955.
 — *The Theology of the Gospel according to Thomas*, New York, 1961.
 — *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament*, Cambridge, 1965.
 Gaster, M., *The Samaritans*, London, 1925.
 Gaston, L., "Sondergut und Markusstoff in Luk. 21," *ThZ* 16 (1960), 162-172.
 — "Beelzebul," *ThZ* 18 (1962), 247-255.
 Gerhardsson, B., *Memory and Manuscript*, Uppsala, 1961.
 Gils, F., *Jésus prophète d'après les évangiles synoptiques*, Louvain, 1957.
 Ginsberg, H. L., "The Oldest Interpretation of the Suffering Servant," *VT* 3 (1953), 400-404.
 Ginzberg, L., *Legends of the Jews*, Vol. I-VII, Philadelphia, 1946.
 Glasson, T. F., *The Second Advent; The Origin of the New Testament Doctrine*, London, 1947.
 — "The Reply to Caiaphas (Mark xiv. 62)," *NTS* 7 (1960), 88-93.
 — "The Ensign of the Son of Man (Matt. xxiv.30)," *JThSt* 15 (1964), 299-300.
 Gloege, G., *Reich Gottes und Kirche im Neuen Testament*, Gütersloh, 1929.
 Gnilya, J., "Die Erwartung des messianischen Hohenpriesters in den Schriften von Qumran und im Neuen Testament," *Rev. Qum.* 2 (1960), 395-426.
 — *Die Verstockung Israels; Isaías 6, 9-10 in der Theologie der Synoptiker*, München, 1961.
 — "Das Gemeinschaftsmahl der Essener," *Bib. Zeit.* 5 (1961), 39-55.
 — "Die essenischen Tauchbäder und die Johannestaufe," *Rev. Qum.* 3 (1961), 185-207.
 — "Der Hymnus des Zacharias," *Bib. Zeit.* 6 (1962), 215-238.
 Goguel, M., "Jésus et la tradition religieuse de son peuple," *Rev. d'Hist. et de Phil. Rel.* 7 (1927), 154-175, 219-244.
 — "La parole de Jésus sur la destruction et la reconstruction du temple," *Congrès d'histoire du Christianisme: Jubilé Alfred Loisy*, Vol. 1, Paris-Amsterdam, 1928, pp. 117-136.
 — *L'église primitif*, Paris, 1947.
 — *The Life of Jesus*, New York, 1948 = *La vie de Jésus*, Paris, 1932.
 — *The Birth of Christianity*, New York, 1954.
 Goppelt, L., *Christentum und Judentum im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert*, Gütersloh, 1954.
 Grant, F. C., *The Gospels; Their Origin and their Growth*, Nashville, 1957.
 Grant, R. M., "The Coming of the Kingdom," *JBL* 67 (1948), 297-303.
 — *Gnosticism and Early Christianity*, New York, 1959.
 Grässer, E., *Das Problem der Parousieverzögerung in den synoptischen Evangelien und in der Apostelgeschichte*, Berlin, 1957.
 Gressmann, H., "Das religionsgeschichtliche Problem des Ursprungs der hellenistischen Erlösungsreligionen," *ZKG N.F.* 3 (1922), 178-191, 4 (1922), 154-180.
 Grundmann, W., *Die Geschichte Jesu Christi*, Berlin, 1959.
 — *Das Evangelium des Lukas*, Berlin, 1964.
 Gunkel, H., *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, Göttingen, 1895.
 Haenchen, E., "Matthäus 23," *ZThK* 48 (1951), 38-62.
 — *Die Apostelgeschichte*, Göttingen, 1959.
 — "Die Komposition von Mk. viii, 27-ix, 1," *NT* 6 (1963), 81-109.
 Hahn, F., *Christologische Hoheitstitel; Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum*, Göttingen, 1963.

- Hahn, F., *Das Verständnis der Mission im Neuen Testament*, Neukirchen, 1965².
- Hahn, W., *Gottesdienst und Opfer Christi; eine Untersuchung über das Heilsgeschehen im christlichen Gottesdienst*, Göttingen, 1951.
- Harder, G., "Das eschatologische Geschichtsbild der sogenannten kleinen Apokalypse Markus 13," *Theologia Viatorum IV*, Berlin, 1952, pp. 71-107.
- Harnack, A. von, *Bruchstücke des Evangeliums und der Apokalypse des Petrus*, T.U. IX, 2, Berlin, 1893.
- *The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels*, London, 1911.
- Harris, J. R., *Testimonies*, Vol. I-II, Cambridge, 1916, 1920.
- Hastings, A., *Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem: A Study of the Teaching of Saint Luke*, Baltimore, 1958.
- Heaton, E. W., *The Book of Daniel*, London, 1956.
- Hegermann, H., *Jesaija 53 im Hexapla, Targum und Peschitta*, Gütersloh, 1954.
- Hefgott, B. W., *The Doctrine of Election in Tannaitic Literature*, New York, 1954.
- Hempel, J., *Die Mehrdeutigkeit der Geschichte als Problem der prophetischen Theologie*, Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen; Phil.-hist. Klasse; Religionswissenschaft; Neue Folge; Band I, Nr. 1, Göttingen, 1936.
- Hengel, M., *Die Zeloten; Untersuchungen zur jüdischen Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I bis 70 n. Chr.*, Leiden, 1961.
- Hennecke, E., *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, 3 Aufl. ed. W. Schneemelcher, Vol. I-II, Tübingen, 1959, 1964.
- Héring, J., *La seconde épître de saint Paul aux Corinthiens*, Neuchâtel, 1958.
- Higgins, A. J. B., "The Sign of the Son of Man (Matt. xxiv.30)," *NTS* 9 (1963), 380-382.
- *Jesus and the Son of Man*, London, 1964.
- Hilgert, E., *The Ship and Related Symbols in the New Testament*, Assen, 1962.
- Hölscher, G., "Der Ursprung der Apokalypse Mk 13," *Th. Bl.* 12 (1933), 193-202.
- Hoffmann, R. A., "Das Wort Jesu von der Zerstörung und dem Wiederaufbau des Tempels," *Neutestamentliche Studien Georg Heinrichs zu seinem 70. Geburtstag*, Leipzig, 1914, pp. 130-139.
- Holtzmann, H. J., *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie*, Freiburg und Leipzig, 1897.
- "Die täglichen Gebetsstunden im Judentum und Urchristentum," *ZNW* 12 (1911), 90-107.
- Hooke, S. H., "The Corner-Stone of Scripture," *The Siege Perilous*, London, 1956, pp. 235-249.
- Hooker, M. D., *Jesus and the Servant*, London, 1959.
- Hummel, R., *Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum im Matthäusevangelium*, München, 1963.
- Hunt, B. P. W. S., *Primitive Gospel Sources*, London, 1951.
- Huppenbauer, H. W., "Belial in den Texten von Qumran," *ThZ* 15 (1959), 81-89.
- "Enderwartung und Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit im Habakuk-Kommentar," *ThZ* 20 (1964), 81-86.
- Iersel, B. van, "The Finding of Jesus in the Temple; Some Observations on the Original Form of Luke ii, 41-51a," *NT* 4 (1960), 161-173.

- Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, The*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, Vol. I-IV, Nashville, 1962.
- Isaksson, A., *Marriage and Ministry in the New Temple*, Lund, 1965.
- Jack, J. W., *The Historic Christ; An Examination of Dr. Robert Eisler's Theory according to the Slavonic Version of Josephus and Other Sources*, London, 1933.
- Jeremias, J., "Der Eckstein," *Angelos* 1 (1925), 65-70.
- *Golgotha und der heilige Felsen*, Angelos-Beiheft 1, Leipzig, 1926.
- "Die Berufung des Nathanael," *Angelos* 3 (1928), 2-5.
- "Ἀνθρώποι εὐδοκίας (Lc 2, 14)," *ZNW* 28 (1929), 13-20.
- "Der Ursprung der Johannestaufe," *ZNW* 28 (1929), 312-320.
- *Jesus als Weltvollender*, Gütersloh, 1930.
- "Zur Hypothese einer schriftlichen Logienquelle Q," *ZNW* 29 (1920), 147-149.
- "κεφαλή γωνίας—ἀρχογωνίατος," *ZNW* 29 (1930), 264-280.
- *Die Passafest der Samariter*, Berlin, 1932.
- "'Lass allda deine Gabe' (Mt 5:23f)," *ZNW* 36 (1937), 150-154.
- "Eckstein-Schlussstein," *ZNW* 36 (1937), 154-157.
- "Eine neue Schau der Zukunftsaussagen Jesu," *Th. Bl.* 20 (1941), 216-222.
- "Der Zusammenstoß Jesu mit dem pharisäischen Oberpriester auf dem Tempelplatz. Zu Pap. Ox. V, 840," *Coniectanea Neotestamentica XI in honorem Antonii Fridrichsen*, Lund, 1947, pp. 97-108.
- "Der Gedanke des 'Heiligen Restes' im Spätjudentum und in der Verkündigung Jesu," *ZNW* 42 (1949), 184-194.
- *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus*, Göttingen, 1949.
- "Kennzeichen der ipsissima vox Jesu," *Synoptische Studien Alfred Wikenhauser zum 70ten Geburtstag dargebracht*, München, 1954, pp. 86-93.
- *Die Gleichnisse Jesu*, Göttingen, 1956⁴.
- "Perikopen-Umstellungen bei Lukas?," *NTS* 4 (1957-58), 115-119.
- *Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu*, Berlin, 1958².
- *Unknown Sayings of Jesus*, London, 1958.
- *Jesus' Promise to the Nations*, London, 1958.
- *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu*, Göttingen, 1960².
- Jervell, J., "Das gespaltene Israel und die Heidenvölker; Zur Motivierung der Heidenmission in der Apostelgeschichte," *Stud. Theol.* 19 (1965), 68-96.
- Jewish Encyclopedia*, The, ed. I. Singer, Vol. I-XII, New York, 1901-1906.
- Johansson, N., *Parakletoi; Vorstellungen von Fürsprechern für die Menschen vor Gott in der alttestamentlichen Religion, im Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*, Lund, 1940.
- Jonas, H., *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*, Göttingen, 1954².
- *The Gnostic Religion*, Boston, 1963².
- Josephus, *Works*, trans. H. St. J. Thackeray, R. Marcus, A. Wikgren, and L. H. Feldmann, Vol. I-IX, London, 1926-1965.
- Joüon, P., *L'évangile de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ*, Paris, 1930.
- Jülicher, A., *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Tübingen, 1906⁵⁻⁶.
- Käsemann, E., "Das Problem des historischen Jesus," *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*, I, Göttingen, 1960², pp. 187-214.

- Käsemann, E., "Sätze heiligen Rechtes im Neuen Testament," *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*, II, Göttingen, 1964, pp. 69-82.
- "Die Anfänge christlicher Theologie," *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*, II, Göttingen, 1964, pp. 82-104.
- "Zum Thema der urchristlichen Apokalyptik," *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*, II, Göttingen, 1964, pp. 105-131.
- Käser, W., "Exegetische und theologische Erwägungen zur Seligpreisung der Kinderlosen Lc 23:29b," *ZNW* 54 (1963), 240-254.
- Kattenbusch, F., "Der Quellort der Kirchenidee," *Festgabe A. von Harnack zum 70. Geburtstag*, Tübingen, 1921, pp. 143-172.
- Kennard, J. S., *Jesus in the Temple*, Tokyo, 1935.
- Kilpatrick, G. D., "Scribes, Lawyers, and Lucan Origins," *JThSt* 1 (1950), 56-60.
- *The Trial of Jesus*, Oxford, 1953.
- "The Gentile Mission in Mark and Mk 13:9-11," *Studies in the Gospels*, ed. D. E. Nineham, Oxford, 1955, pp. 145-158.
- King, N. Q., "The 'Universalism' of the Third Gospel," *Studia Evangelica* I (T.U. 73), Berlin, 1959, pp. 199-205.
- Klausner, J., *The Messianic Idea in Israel from its Beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah*, New York, 1955.
- Klein, G., "Die Prüfung der Zeit (Lukas 12, 54-56)," *ZThK* 61 (1964), 373-390.
- Kleist, J. A., "The Two False Witnesses (Mk 14:55ff)," *Cath. Bib. Quart.* 9 (1947), 321-323.
- Klijn, A. F. J., "Stephen's Speech—Acts VII.2-53," *NTS* 4 (1957-58), 25-31.
- Klostermann, E., *Das Markusevangelium*, Tübingen, 1950⁴.
- Knox, J., *The Death of Christ; The Cross in New Testament History and Faith*, London, 1959.
- Knox, W. L., *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem*, Cambridge, 1925.
- *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels*, Cambridge, I *St. Mark*, 1953; II *St. Luke and St. Matthew*, 1957.
- Koh, R., *The Writings of St. Luke*, Hongkong, 1953.
- Kosmala, H., *Hebräer-Essener-Christen; Studien zur Vorgeschichte der früh-christlichen Verkündigung*, Leiden, 1959.
- "The Conclusion of Matthew," *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute IV*, Leiden, 1965, pp. 132-147.
- Kraeling, C. H., *Anthropos and the Son of Man*, New York, 1927.
- *John the Baptist*, New York, 1951.
- Kraft, H., "Die altkirchliche Prophetie und die Entstehung des Montanismus," *ThZ* 11 (1955), 249-271.
- Kramer, W., *Christos, Kyrios, Gottessohn*, Zürich, 1963.
- Kraus, H. J., *Psalmen*, Neukirchen, 1960.
- Kümmel, W. G., *Die Eschatologie der Evangelien; Ihre Geschichte und ihr Sinn*, Leipzig, 1936.
- *Kirchenbegriff und Geschichtsbewusstsein in der Urgemeinde und bei Jesus*, Uppsala, 1943.
- "Das Gleichnis von den bösen Weingärtnern (Mark. 12.1-9)," *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne*, Neuchâtel, 1950, pp. 120-131.
- "Jesus und die Anfänge der Kirche," *Stud. Theol.* 7 (1953), 1-27.
- *Promise and Fulfillment*, London, 1957.
- "Futurische und präsentische Eschatologie im ältesten Urchristentum," *NTS* 5 (1959), 113-126.

- Kümmel, Feine, Behm, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Heidelberg, 1965¹⁴
- Kuhn, K. G., "Les rouleaux de cuivre de Qumrân," *Rev. Bib.* 61 (1954), 193-205.
- "The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran," *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. K. Stendahl, New York, 1957, pp. 65-93.
- Laible, H., "Der zerrissene Tempelvorhang und die eingestürzte Oberschwelle des Tempeleingangs vom Talmud bezeugt," *Neue kirchl. Zeitschr.* 35 (1924), 287-314.
- Lampe, G. W. H., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford, 1961ff.
- Lane, W. R., "A New Commentary Structure in 4QFlorilegium," *JBL* 78 (1959), 343-346.
- Laurentin, R., *Structure et théologie de Luc i-ii*, Paris, 1957.
- Lauterbach, J., "The Pharisees and their Teachings," *HUCA* 6 (1929), 69-139.
- Leaney, A. R. C., *A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke*, New York, 1958.
- "The Birth Narrative in St. Luke and St. Matthew," *NTS* 8 (1961-62), 158-166.
- "The Eschatological Significance of Suffering in the Old Testament and the Dead Sea Scrolls," *SJT* 16 (1963), 286-296.
- *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning; Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, Philadelphia, 1966.
- Léon-Dufour, X., "Le signe du temple selon saint Jean," *Rech. sci. rel.* 39 (1951-52), 155-175.
- Lévi, I., *The Hebrew Text of the Book of Ecclesiasticus*, Leiden, 1904.
- Liberty, S., *The Political Relations of Christ's Ministry*, Oxford, 1916.
- Lidzbarski, M., *Das Johannesbuch der Mandäer*, Vol. I-II, Giessen, 1915.
- *Ginza, Der Schatz oder das Grosse Buch der Mandäer*, Göttingen, 1925.
- Lietzmann, H., *Der Menschensohn; Ein Beitrag zur neutestamentlichen Theologie*, Leipzig, 1896.
- *Der Prozess Jesu*, Sitzungsbericht d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.; phil.-hist. Kl. 23-24, Berlin, 1931, pp. 310-322.
- Lightfoot, J. B., *St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, London, 1879.
- Lightfoot, R. H., *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels*, London, 1938.
- *The Gospel Message of St. Mark*, Oxford, 1950.
- Lindars, B., *New Testament Apologetic; The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations*, Philadelphia, 1961.
- Lindblom, J., "Der Eckstein in Jes. 28, 16," *Norsk Theol. Tids.* 56 (1955), 123-132.
- Lindeskog, G., "The Veil of the Temple," *Coniect. Neotest.* 11 (1947), 132-137.
- Linton, O., "The Trial of Jesus and the Interpretation of Psalm CX," *NTS* 7 (1960-61), 258-262.
- Loewe, H., "Render unto Caesar"; *Religious and Political Loyalty in Palestine*, Cambridge, 1940.
- Lohmeyer, E., *Kyrios Jesus; Eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2,5-11*, Sitzungsberichte d. Heidelberger Akad. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl., Heidelberg, 1927-28.
- *Das Urchristentum; I Buch: Johannes der Täufer*, Göttingen, 1932.
- *Galiläa und Jerusalem*, Göttingen, 1936.
- "Die Reinigung des Tempels," *Th. Bl.* 20 (1941), 257-264.
- *Kultus und Evangelium*, Göttingen, 1942 = *Lord of the Temple*, Edinburgh, 1961.

- Lohmeyer, E., "Mir ist gegeben alle Gewalt!, Eine Exegese von Mt. 28, 16-20," *In Memoriam Ernst Lohmeyer*, Stuttgart, 1951, pp. 22-49.
- "Das Gleichnis von den bösen Weingärtnern (Mark. 12, 1-12)," *Urchristliche Mystik*, Darmstadt, 1956, pp. 161-181.
- *Der Brief an die Philipper, an die Kolosser und an Philemon*, Göttingen, 1956¹¹.
- *Das Evangelium des Matthäus*, ed. W. Schmauch, Göttingen, 1958².
- *Das Evangelium des Markus*, Göttingen, 1959¹⁵.
- *Das Vater-Unser*, Göttingen, 1960⁴.
- Lohse, E., *Märtyrer und Gottesknecht; Untersuchungen zur urchristlichen Verkündigung vom Sühnetod Jesus Christi*, Göttingen, 1955.
- Loisy, A., *Les origines du Nouveau Testament*, Paris, 1936.
- Macdonald, J., *The Theology of the Samaritans*, London, 1964.
- MacNeill, H. L., "The Sitz im Leben of Lk 1.5-2.20," *JBL* 65 (1946), 123-130.
- Macuch, R., "Alter und Heimat des Mandäismus nach neuerschlossenen Quellen," *ThLZ* 82 (1957), 401-408.
- Maier, J., *Die Texte vom Toten Meer*, Vol. I-II, München and Basel, 1960.
- Mánek, J., "The New Exodus in the Books of Luke," *NT* 2 (1957), 8-23.
- Manson, T. W., *The Teaching of Jesus; Studies of its Form and Content*, Cambridge, 1931.
- "The Sayings of Jesus," *The Mission and Message of Jesus*, New York, 1938, pp. 300-640.
- "Mark 2:27f," *Coniect. Neotest.* 11 (1947), 138-146.
- "The New Testament Basis of the Doctrine of the Church," *JEH* 1 (1950), 1-11.
- *The Servant Messiah*, Cambridge, 1953.
- "Realized Eschatology and the Messianic Secret," *Studies in the Gospels; Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, Oxford, 1955, pp. 209-222.
- *Jesus and the Non-Jews*, London, 1955.
- "The Work of St. Luke," *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles*, ed. M. Black, Manchester, 1962, pp. 46-67.
- "The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch, and the Gospels," *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles*, pp. 123-145.
- Manson, W., *Jesus the Messiah; The Synoptic Tradition of the Revelation of God in Christ: With Special Reference to Form-Criticism*, London, 1943.
- "The ΕΓΩ ΕΙΜΙ of the Messianic Presence in the New Testament," *JTS* 48 (1947), 137-145.
- *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, London, 1951.
- Mantel, H., *Studies in the History of the Sanhedrin*, Cambridge, Mass., 1961.
- Martin-Achard, M., *A Light to the Nations*, Edinburgh, 1962.
- Marxsen, W., *Der Evangelist Markus; Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Evangeliums*, Göttingen, 1959².
- Masson, C., *L'épître de saint Paul aux Éphésiens*, Neuchâtel, 1953.
- May, H. G., "Some Cosmic Connotations of Mašm Rabbm, Many Waters," *JBL* 74 (1955), 9-21.
- McArthur, H. K., "Mark xiv. 62," *NTS* 4 (1958), 156-158.
- McCasland, S. V., "Portents in Josephus and in the Gospels," *JBL* 51 (1932), 323-335.
- McKelvey, R. J., "Christ the Cornerstone," *NTS* 8 (1962), 352-359.
- Meinertz, M., "'Dieses Geschlecht' im Neuen Testament," *Bib. Zeit.* 1 (1957), 283-289.

- Mendner, S., "Die Tempelreinigung," *ZNW* 47 (1956), 93-112.
- Menoud, P., "Remarques sur les textes de l'ascension dans Luc-Actes," *Neutestamentliche Studien für R. Bultmann*, Berlin, 1954, pp. 148-156.
- "Pendant quarante jours (Actes 1, 3)," *Neotestamentica et Patristica*, Leiden, 1962, pp. 148-156.
- Merx, A., *Das Evangelium Matthäus nach der syrischen im Sinaikloster gefundenen Palimpsesthandschrift*, Berlin, 1902.
- *Die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas*, Berlin, 1905.
- *Der Messias oder Ta'eb der Samaritaner*, Berlin, 1909.
- Metzger, B. M., trans., *The Gospel of Thomas*, in Aland, K., *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*, Stuttgart, 1964², pp. 517-532.
- Meyer, E., *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, Vol. I-III, Stuttgart-Berlin, 1921-23.
- Michaelis, W., *Der Herr verzieht nicht die Verheissung*, Bern, 1942.
- Michel, O., *Prophet und Märtyrer*, Gütersloh, 1932.
- *Das Zeugnis des Neuen Testaments von der Gemeinde*, Göttingen, 1941.
- "Menschensohn und Völkerwelt," *EMZ* 2 (1941), 257-267.
- "Der Abschluss des Matthäusevangeliums," *Ev. Th.* 10 (1950), 16-26.
- "Spätjüdisches Prophetentum," *Neutestamentliche Studien für R. Bultmann*, Berlin, 1954, pp. 60-66.
- *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, Göttingen, 1957¹⁰.
- Midrash Rabbah*, ed. H. Freedman and M. Simon, Vol. I-X, London, 1939.
- Milik, J. T., "Le travail d'édition des manuscrits de Qumran," *Rev. Bib.* 63 (1956), 47-67.
- *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*, London, 1959.
- Mishnah*, trans. H. Danby, London, 1933.
- Moffatt, J., *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, Edinburgh, 1918².
- Montefiore, H. W., "Does 'L' Hold Water?," *JTS* 12 (1961), 59-60.
- "Revolt in the Desert? (Mark VI.30ff)," *NTS* 8 (1962), 135-141.
- Montgomery, J. A., *The Samaritans*, Philadelphia, 1907.
- Moore, G. F., *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim*, Vol. I-III, Cambridge, Mass., 1927, 1930.
- Moule, C. F. D., "Sanctuary and Sacrifice in the Church of the New Testament," *JTS* 1 (1950), 29-41.
- "From Defendant to Judge—and Deliverer," *SNTS Bulletin* 3 (1952), 40-53.
- "Once More, Who were the Hellenists?," *Ex. Times* 70 (1959), 100-102.
- *Worship in the New Testament*, Richmond, 1961.
- *The Birth of the New Testament*, New York, 1962.
- Mowinkel, S., *Le décalogue*, Paris, 1927.
- *He That Cometh; The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism*, Oxford, 1956.
- Münderlein, G., "Die Verfluchung des Feigenbaums (Mk XI. 12-14)," *NTS* 10 (1963), 89-104.
- Munck, J., *Petrus und Paulus in der Offenbarung Johannis*, Copenhagen, 1950.
- "Discours d'adieu dans le Nouveau Testament et dans la littérature biblique," *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne*, Neuchâtel, 1950, pp. 155-170.
- *Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte*, Copenhagen, 1954.
- *Christus und Israel*, Aarhus, 1956.
- "Jewish Christianity in Post-Apostolic Times," *NTS* 6 (1960), 103-116.

- Murmelstein, B., "Adam, ein Beitrag zur Messiaslehre," *WZKM* 35 (1928), 242-275.
- "Jesu Gang durch die Saatfelder," *Angeos* 3 (1930), 111-120.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J., "La 'vérité' chez saint Paul et à Qumran," *Rev. Bib.* 72 (1965), 29-76.
- Nauck, W., "Freude im Leiden; Zum Problem einer urchristlichen Verfolgungstradition," *ZNW* 46 (1955), 68-80.
- *Die Tradition und der Charakter des ersten Johannesbriefes*, Tübingen, 1957.
- Nepper-Christensen, P., "Das verborgene Herrnwort; Eine Untersuchung über 1. Thess. 4, 13-18," *Stud. Theol.* 19 (1965), 136-154.
- Nestle, E., "Der Greuel der Verwüstung, Dan. 9:27; 11:31; 12:11," *ZAW* 4 (1884), 248.
- Neusner, J., *A Life of Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai*, Leiden, 1962.
- Noack, B., *Das Gottesreich bei Lukas; Eine Studie zu Luk. 17, 20-24*, Uppsala, 1948.
- Nötscher, F., "Heiligkeit in den Qumranschriften," *Rev. Qum.* 2 (1960), 163-181, 315-344.
- Norden, E., *Die Geburt des Kindes*, Leipzig, Berlin, 1924.
- North, C., *The Second Isaiah*, Oxford, 1964.
- Noth, M., "Zur Komposition des Buches Daniel," *Th. St. Kr.* 98/99 (1926), 143-163.
- "Jerusalem und die israelitische Tradition," *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, München, 1957, pp. 172-187.
- "Das Geschichtsverständnis der alttestamentlichen Apokalyptik," *Gesammelte Studien*, pp. 248-273.
- "Die Heiligen des Höchsten," *Gesammelte Studien*, pp. 274-290.
- Odeberg, H., *The Fourth Gospel*, Uppsala, 1929.
- Oepke, A., *Das neue Gottesvolk in Schriftum, Schauspiel, bildender Kunst und Weltgestaltung*, Gütersloh, 1950.
- "Der Herrnspruch über die Kirche Mt 16, 17-19 in der neuesten Forschung," *Stud. Theol.* 2 (1950), 110-165.
- Oesterley, W. O. E., "Temple," *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, Edinburgh, 1908, Vol. II, pp. 708-713.
- Oliver, H. H., "The Lucan Birth Stories and the Purpose of Luke-Acts," *NTS* 10 (1964), 202-226.
- O'Neill, J. C., *The Theology of Acts*, London, 1961.
- Otto, R., *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*, London, 1943².
- Owen, H. P., "The Parousia of Christ in the Synoptic Gospels," *Scot. Journ. Theol.* 12 (1959), 171-192.
- Parker, P., "A Proto-Lucan Basis for the Gospel according to the Hebrews," *JBL* 59 (1940), 471-478.
- "The 'Former Treatise' and the Date of Acts," *JBL* 84 (1965), 52-58.
- Parkes, J., *The Foundations of Judaism and Christianity*, Chicago, 1960.
- Parsons, E. W., *A Historical Examination of Some Non-Markan Elements in Luke*, Chicago, 1914.
- Patai, R., *Man and Temple in Ancient Jewish Myth and Ritual*, London, 1947.
- Pedersen, J., *Israel*, Vol. I-IV, Copenhagen and London, 1926, 1940.
- Pedersen, S., "Zum Problem der vaticinia ex eventu; Eine Analyse von Mt. 21, 33-46 par.; 22, 1-10 par.," *Stud. Theol.* 19 (1965), 167-188.

- Percy, E., *Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe*, Lund, 1946.
 — *Die Botschaft Jesu; Eine traditionskritische und exegetische Untersuchung*, Lund, 1953.
- Perrin, N., *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus*, London, 1963.
 — "Mark 14. 62: End Product of a Christian Peshet Tradition?," *NTS* 12 (1965-66), 150-155.
- Perry, A. M., *The Sources of Luke's Passion Narrative*, Chicago, 1920.
- Petrie, S., "'Q' is only what you make it," *NT* 3 (1959), 28-33.
- Pfammatter, J., *Die Kirche als Bau; Eine exegetisch-theologische Studie zur Ekklesiologie der Paulusbriefe*, Roma, 1960.
- Pickl, J., *Messiaskönig Jesus in der Auffassung seiner Zeitgenossen*, München, 1935².
- Piganiol, A., "Observations sur la date de l'apocalypse synoptique," *Rev. d'Hist. et Phil. Rel* 4 (1924), 245-249.
- Plooi, D., "Jesus and the Temple," *Ex. Times* 42 (1930-31), 36-40.
 — *Studies in the Testimony Book*, Amsterdam, 1932.
- Preiss, T., "The Mystery of the Son of Man," *Life in Christ*, London, 1954, pp. 43-60.
- Procksch, O., *Jesaiiah 1-39*, Leipzig, 1930.
- Quispel, G., "Nathanael und der Menschensohn (Joh 1, 51)," *ZNW* 47 (1956), 281-283.
 — "Some Remarks on the Gospel of Thomas," *NTS* 5 (1959), 276-290.
Die Texte aus Qumran, ed. E. Lohse, Darmstadt, 1964.
- Rabin, C., *The Zadokite Documents*, Oxford, 1954.
- Rad, G. von, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, Vol. I-II, München, 1958², 1960.
 — "Die Stadt auf dem Berge," *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, München, 1958, pp. 214-224.
 — "'Gerechtigkeit' und 'Leben' in der Kultsprache der Psalmen," *Gesammelte Studien*, pp. 225-247.
- Rahmani, I. E., ed., *Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi*, Moguntiae, 1899.
- Ramsey, A. M., "What was the Ascension?," *SNTS Bulletin* 2 (1951), 43-50.
- Rau, G., "Das Volk in der lukanischen Passionsgeschichte; Eine Konjektur zu Lk 23:13," *ZNW* 56 (1965), 41-51.
- Rehkopf, F., *Die lukanische Sonderquelle; Ihr Umfang und Sprachgebrauch*, Tübingen, 1959.
- Reicke, B., "Den primäre israelsmissionen och hednamissionen enligt synoptikerna," *Svensk theol. kvartalskr.* 26 (1950), 77-100.
 — *Diakonie, Festfreude und Zelos; In Verbindung mit der altchristlichen Agapenfeier*, Uppsala, 1951.
 — "A Synopsis of Early Christian Preaching," *The Root of the Vine*, Westminster, 1953, pp. 128-160.
 — "Der geschichtliche Hintergrund des Apostelkonzils und der Antiochia-Episode Gal 2, 1-14," *Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan*, Haarlem, 1953, pp. 172-187.
 — *Glauben und Leben der Urgemeinde*, Zürich, 1957.
 — "Instruction and Discussion in the Travel Narrative," *Studia Evangelica* I (T.U. 73), Berlin, 1959, pp. 206-216.
 — *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, Berlin, 1965.

- Reitzenstein, R., *Das mandäische Buch des Herrn der Grösse und die Evangelienüberlieferung*, Heidelberg, 1919.
- Rengstorff, K. H., "Die Stadt der Mörder (Mt 22:7)," *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche*, Berlin, 1960, pp. 106-129.
- *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, Göttingen, 1962¹⁰.
- Richardson, A., *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament*, New York, 1958.
- Richardson, H. N., "Some Notes on 1QSa," *JBL* 76 (1957), 108-122.
- Ridderbos, H., *The Coming of the Kingdom*, Philadelphia, 1962.
- Riddle, D. W., *The Martyrs; A Study in Social Control*, Chicago, 1931.
- Rigaux, B., *Les épîtres aux Thessaloniciens*, Paris, 1956.
- Riggenbach, E., *Auf den Trümmern Jerusalems*, Basel, 1923.
- Rissi, M., "Das Judenproblem im Lichte der Johannesapokalypse," *ThZ* 13 (1957), 241-259.
- "The Rider on the White Horse," *Interpretation* 18 (1964), 407-418.
- *Die Zukunft der Welt; Eine exegetische Studie über Johannesoffenbarung 19, 11 bis 22, 15*, Basel, n.d. (1966).
- Robinson, J. A. T., *The Body; A Study in Pauline Theology*, London, 1952.
- *Jesus and His Coming; The Emergence of a Doctrine*, London, 1957.
- "Elijah, John and Jesus," *NTS* 4 (1958), 263-281.
- "The Most Primitive Christology of All?," *JTS* 7 (1956), 177-189.
- Robinson, W. C. Jr., *Der Weg des Herrn; Studien zur Geschichte und Eschatologie im Lukas-Evangelium*, Hamburg, 1964.
- Rössler, D., *Gesetz und Geschichte; Untersuchungen zur Theologie der jüdischen Apokalyphtik und der pharisäischen Orthodoxie*, Neukirchen, 1960.
- Rordorf, W., *Der Sonntag*, Zürich, 1962.
- Roth, C., "The Cleansing of the Temple and Zechariah xiv. 21," *NT* 4 (1960), 174-181.
- Rowley, H. H., "The Baptism of John and the Qumran Sect," *New Testament Essays; Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson*, Manchester, 1959, pp. 218-229.
- *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, London, 1963³.
- "The Suffering Servant and the Davidic Messiah," *The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament*, Oxford, 1965², pp. 63-93.
- Rudolf, K., *Die Mandäer*, Vol. I-II, Göttingen, 1960, 1961.
- Russel, H. G., "Which Was Written First, Luke or Acts?," *HTR* 48 (1956), 167-174.
- Sahlin, H., *Der Messias und das Gottesvolk; Studien zur Protolukanische Theologie*, Uppsala, 1945.
- *Studien zum Dritten Kapitel des Lukasevangeliums*, Uppsala, 1949.
- *Die Beschneidung Christi*, Uppsala, 1950.
- Schäfer, K. Th., "...und dann werden sie fasten, an jenem Tage' (Mk 2, 20 und Par)," *Synoptische Studien A. Wikenhauser dargebracht*, München, 1953, pp. 124-147.
- Schechter, S., *Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*, New York, 1961².
- Schlatter, A., *Das Alte Testament in der johanneischen Apokalypse*, Gütersloh, 1912.
- *Die beiden Schwerter, Lukas 22, 35-38; Ein Stück aus der besonderen Quelle des Lukas*, Gütersloh, 1916.
- *Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament; 2 Die Evangelien nach Markus und Lukas*, Stuttgart, 1947.
- *Das Evangelium des Lukas, aus seinen Quellen erklärt*, Stuttgart, 1960².

- Schlier, H., "Die Entscheidung für die Heidenmission in der Urchristenheit," *EMZ* 3 (1942), 166-182, 208-212.
- *Der Brief an die Galater*, Göttingen, 1951¹¹.
- Schmauch, W., *Orte der Offenbarung und der Offenbarungsort im Neuen Testament*, Berlin, 1956.
- Schmid, J., *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, Regensburg, 1958².
- Schmidt, C., *Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach der Auferstehung*, Leipzig, 1919.
- Schmidt, K. L., *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu; Literarkritische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung*, Berlin, 1919.
- "Die Erbauung der Kirche mit ihren Gliedern als den 'Fremdlingen und Beisassen auf Erden' (Heb 11. 13)," *Wesen und Aufgabe der Kirche in der Welt*, Zürich, 1947, pp. 5-30.
- "Jerusalem als Urbild und Abbild," *Eranos Jahrbuch* 18 (1950), 207-248.
- Schmithals, W., *Paulus und Jakobus*, Göttingen, 1963.
- Schmitz, O., *Die Opferanschauungen des späteren Judentums und die Opferanschauungen des Neuen Testaments; Eine Untersuchung ihres geschichtlichen Verhältnisses*, Tübingen, 1910.
- Schnackenburg, R., "Die 'Anbetung in Geist und Wahrheit' (Jch 4, 23) im Lichte von Qumran-Texten," *Bib. Zeit.* 3 (1959), 88-94.
- "Die Erwartung des 'Propheten' nach dem Neuen Testament und den Qumran-Texten," *Studia Evangelica* I (T.U. 73), Berlin, 1959, pp. 622-639.
- Schneider, J., "Zur Analyse des lukanischen Reiseberichtes," *Synoptische Studien A. Wikenhauser dargebracht*, München, 1953, pp. 207-229.
- Schniewind, J., *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, Göttingen, 1947⁴.
- *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, Göttingen, 1954⁷.
- Schoeps, H. J., *Theologie und Geschichte des Judentums*, Tübingen, 1949.
- "Jakobus ὁ δίκαιος καὶ ὁ βλάσ," *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit*, Tübingen, 1950, pp. 120-125.
- "Die jüdischen Prophetenmorde," *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit*, pp. 126-143.
- "Die Tempelzerstörung des Jahres 70 in der jüdischen Religionsgeschichte," *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit*, pp. 144-183.
- "Jesus und das jüdische Gesetz," *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit*, pp. 212-220.
- *Israel und Christenheit; Jüdisch-christliches Religionsgespräch in neunzehn Jahrhunderten*, München und Frankfurt a/M., 1961.
- Schreiber, J., "Die Christologie des Markusevangeliums; Beobachtungen zur Theologie und Komposition des Zweiten Evangeliums," *ZThK* 58 (1961), 154-183.
- Schrenk, G., *Die Weissagungen über Israel im Neuen Testament*, Zürich, 1951.
- Schürer, E., *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, Leipzig, 1901-1909⁴.
- Schürmann, H., "Zur Traditions- und Redaktionsgeschichte von Mt 10, 23," *Bib. Zeit.* (1959), 82-88.
- Schwartz, E., "Der verfluchte Feigenbaum," *ZNW* 5 (1904), 80-84.
- Schwartz, A., *The Quest of the Historical Jesus; A Critical Study of its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede*, New York, 1948.
- Schweizer, E., "Eine hebräisierende Sonderquelle des Lukas?" *ThZ* 6 (1950), 161-185.
- "Abendmahl I. Im Neuen Testament," *RGK* I, 1957², Sp. 10-21.

- "Der Menschensohn (Zur eschatologischen Erwartung Jesu)," *ZNW* 50 (1959), 185-209.
- *Lordship and Discipleship*, London, 1960.
- Scobie, C. H., *John the Baptist*, London, 1964.
- Seeberg, A., *Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit*, Leipzig, 1903.
- Seeligmann, I. L., *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah*, Leiden, 1948.
- "Voraussetzungen der Midrash-Exegese," *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* 1, Leiden, 1953, pp. 150-181.
- Seitz, O. J. F., "Upon this Rock: A Critical Re-examination of Matt. 16:17-19," *JBL* 69 (1950), 329-340.
- Selwyn, E. G., *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, London, 1947².
- Sharman, H. B., *The Teaching of Jesus about the Future according to the Synoptic Gospels*, Chicago, 1909.
- Silbermann, L. H., "Unriddling the Riddle; A Study in the Structure and Language of the Habakkuk Pesher," *Rev. Qum.* 11 (1961), 323-364.
- Simkhovitch, V. G., *Toward the Understanding of Jesus*, New York, 1921.
- Simon, M., *Verus Israel: étude sur les relations entre Chrétiens et Juifs dans l'Empire Romain*, Paris, 1948.
- "Retour du Christ et reconstruction du temple dans la pensée chrétienne primitive," *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne*, Neuchâtel, 1950, pp. 247-257.
- "Saint Stephen and the Jerusalem Temple," *Jour Eccl. Hist.* 2 (1951), 127-142.
- "La prophétie de Nathan et le temple," *Rev. d'Hist. et de Phil. Rel.* 32 (1952), 41-58.
- *Saint Stephen and the Hellenists in the Primitive Church*, London, 1958.
- Sjöberg, E., "The Church and the Cultus in the New Testament," *This is the Church*, ed. A. Nygren, Philadelphia, 1952, pp. 75-99.
- Skehan, P. W., "Exodus in the Samaritan Recension from Qumran," *JBL* 74 (1955), 182-187.
- Souček, J. B., "Salz der Erde und Licht der Welt; Zur Exegese von Matth. 5, 13-16," *ThZ* 19 (1963), 169-179.
- Spadafora, F., *Gesù e la Fine di Gerusalemme*, Rovigo, 1950.
- Sperber, A., ed., *The Bible in Aramaic; III The Latter Prophets according to Targum Jonathan*, Leiden, 1962.
- Spitta, F., "Die grosse eschatologische Rede Jesu," *Th. St. Kr.* 82 (1909), 348-401.
- *Die synoptische Grundschrift in ihrer Überlieferung durch das Lukas-evangelium*, Leipzig, 1912.
- Stählin, G., "Die Endschau Jesu und die Heidenmission," *EMZ* 7 (1950), 97-105, 134-147.
- Staerk, W., *Altjüdische liturgische Gebete*, Berlin, 1930².
- *Soter I; Die biblische Erlösererwartung als religionsgeschichtliches Problem*, Gütersloh, 1933.
- *Soter II; Die Erlösererwartung in den östlichen Religionen*, Gütersloh, 1938.
- Stauffer, E., "Das Tor des Nikanor," *ZNW* 44 (1952), 44-66.
- "Messias oder Menschensohn," *NT* 1 (1956), 81-102.
- *Jesus, Gestalt und Geschichte*, Bern, 1957.
- *New Testament Theology*, London, 1963⁵.
- Stendahl, K., *The School of St. Matthew*, Uppsala, 1954.
- Strack, H. L., *Jesus, die Häretiker und die Christen nach den ältesten jüdischen Angaben*, Leipzig, 1910.

- Strecker, G., *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen*, Berlin, 1958.
- *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit*, Göttingen, 1962.
- Streeter, B. H., *The Four Gospels*, London, 1924.
- Strobel, A., "Abfassung und Geschichtstheologie der Apokalypse nach Kap. XVII. 9-12," *NTS* 10 (1964), 433-445.
- Suggs, M. J., "Wisdom of Solomon 2:10-15: A Homily based on the Fourth Servant Song," *JBL* 76 (1957), 26-33.
- Sundkler, B., *Jésus et les païens*, Uppsala, 1937.
- Talmud, The Babylonian*, ed. I. Epstein, 18 Vols., London, 1935-1948.
- Taylor, V., *Behind the Third Gospel: A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis*, Oxford, 1926.
- *Jesus and His Sacrifice: A Study of the Passion Sayings in the Gospels*, London, 1937.
- *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, London, 1952.
- "Important Hypotheses Reconsidered; I The Proto-Luke Hypothesis," *Ex. Times* 67 (1955-56), 12-16.
- Teeple, H. M., *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet*, Philadelphia, 1957.
- "The Origin of the Son of Man Christology," *JBL* 84 (1965), 213-250.
- Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, ed. Kittel, G., Friedrich, G., Stuttgart, Bd. I-VII, 1933-1964.
- Thielicke, H., *Gericht und Heimsuchung*, Tübingen, 1948.
- Thomas, J., *Le mouvement baptiste en Palestine et Syrie (150 av. J.-C.-300 ap. J.-C.)*, Gembloux, 1935.
- Thyen, H., βάπτισμα μετανόας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, *Zeit und Geschichte*, ed. E. Dinkler, Tübingen, 1964, pp. 97-125.
- Tödt, H. E., *Der Menschensohn in der synoptischen Überlieferung*, Gütersloh, 1959.
- Torrey, C. C., *Documents of the Primitive Church*, New York, 1941.
- Townsend, J. T., *The Jerusalem Temple in New Testament Thought*, Diss., Harvard Divinity School, 1958.
- Trilling, W., *Das wahre Israel; Studien zur Theologie des Matthäusevangeliums*, Leipzig, 1959.
- Turner, N., "The Relations of Luke I and II to Hebraic Sources and to the Rest of Luke-Acts," *NTS* 2 (1956), 100-109.
- Tyson, J. S., "The Lukan Version of the Trial of Jesus," *NT* 3 (1959), 249-258.
- Unnik, W. C. van, "Jesus the Christ," *NTS* 8 (1961-62), 101-116.
- Vaux, R. de, "Fouilles de Khirbet Qumran; Rapport préliminaire sur les 3e, 4e et 5e campagnes," *Rev. Bib.* 63 (1956), 533-577.
- Vermès, G., "A propos des commentaires bibliques découverts à Qumrân," *Rev. d'Hist. et de Phil. Rel.* 35 (1955), 95-103.
- *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*, Leiden, 1961.
- Vielhauer, P., *Oikodome; Das Bild vom Bau in der christlichen Literatur vom Neuen Testament bis Clemens Alexandrinus*, Karlsruhe, 1940.
- "Zum 'Paulinismus' der Apostelgeschichte," *Ev. Theol.* 10 (1950), 1-15.
- "Die Apokalyptik," "Die Prophetie," und "Apokalyptik des Urchristentums," in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, II, pp. 408-421, 422-427, 428-454.
- "Das Benedictus des Zacharias (Lk 1,68-79)," *Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament*, München, 1965, pp. 28-46.

- "Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu," *Aufsätze*, pp. 55-91.
- "Jesus und der Menschensohn; Zur Diskussion mit Heinz Eduard Tödt und Eduard Schweizer," *Aufsätze*, pp. 92-140.
- Vincent, A., *La Religion des Judéo-Araméens d'Éléphantine*, Paris, 1937.
- Völter, D., *Die evangelischen Erzählungen von der Geburt und Kindheit Jesu*, Strassburg, 1911.
- Vogt, E., "'Peace among Men of God's Good Pleasure' (Lk. 2:14)," *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. K. Stendahl, New York, 1957, pp. 114-117.
- Volz, P., *Der Prophet Jeremiah*, Leipzig, 1922.
- *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter nach den Quellen der rabbinischen, apokalyptischen und apokryphen Literatur dargestellt*, Tübingen, 1934.
- "Die radikale Ablehnung der Kultreligion durch die alttestamentlichen Propheten," *Zeit. syst. Theol.* 14 (1937), 63-85.
- Waard, J. de, *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament*, Leiden, 1965.
- Wallace, D. H., "The Essenes and Temple Sacrifice," *ThZ* 13 (1957), 335-338.
- Weinreich, O., "Türöffnung im Wunder-, Prodigien- und Zauberglauben der Antike, des Judentums und Christentums," *Genethliakon Wilhelm Schmidt*, Stuttgart, 1929, pp. 200-264.
- Weiss, B., *Die Evangelien des Markus und des Lukas*, Göttingen, 1901⁶.
- *Die Quellen des Lukasevangeliums*, Stuttgart, 1907.
- Weiss, J., *Der erste Korintherbrief*, Göttingen, 1925².
- Wellhausen, J., *Das Evangelium Marci*, Berlin, 1909².
- *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, Berlin, 1911².
- Wenschkewitz, H., *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe: Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament*, Angelos-Beiheft 4, Leipzig, 1932.
- Wetherall, J., *The Destruction of Jerusalem, an absolute and irrevistible proof of the divine origin of Christianity: including a narrative of the calamities which befel the Jews, so far as they tend to verify our Lord's predictions relative to that event; with a brief description of the city and temple*, Providence, 1818⁷.
- Wieder, N., *The Judean Scrolls and Karaism*, London, 1962.
- Wilckens, U., *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte*, Neukirchen, 1961.
- Wilcox, M., "The Old Testament in Acts 1-15," *Australian Biblical Review* V, 1-2 (July 1956), 2-41.
- *The Semitisms of Acts*, Oxford, 1965.
- Wilder, A. N., *Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus*, New York, 1950².
- Williams, C. S. C., "The Date of Luke-Acts," *Ex. Times* 64 (1952-53), 283-284.
- "Luke-Acts in Recent Study," *Ex. Times* 73 (1961-62), 133-136.
- Wilson, R. McL., "Some Recent Studies in the Lucan Infancy Narratives," *Studia Evangelica I* (T.U. 73), Berlin, 1959, pp. 235-253.
- Windisch, H., "Der Untergang Jerusalems (Anno 70) im Urtheil der Christen und Juden," *Theol. Tijds.* 48 (1914), 519-550.
- *Der Barnabasbrief*, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament: Die Apostolischen Väter, Tübingen, 1920, pp. 299-413.
- "Die Sprüche vom Eingehen in das Reich Gottes," *ZNW* 27 (1928), 163-192.
- *Paulus und Christus*, Leipzig, 1934.

- Winter, P., "The Treatment of his Sources by the Third Evangelist in Luke XXI-XXIV," *Stud. Theol.* 8 (1954), 138-172.
- "Luke 2, 49 and Targum Yerushalmi," *ZNW* 45 (1954), 145-179.
- "Magnificat and Benedictus-Maccabean Psalms?," *Bull. Jn. Ryl. Lib.* 37 (1954-55), 328-347.
- "The Cultural Background of the Narrative in Luke i and ii," *JQR* 45 (1954), 159-167, 230-242.
- "Some Observations on the Language in the Birth and Infancy Stories of the Third Gospel," *NTS* 1 (1954-55), 111-158.
- "The Proto-Source of Luke 1," *NT* 1 (1956), 184-199.
- "On Luke and Lucan Sources," *ZNW* 47 (1956), 217-242.
- "'Nazareth' and 'Jerusalem' in Luke chs. I and II," *NTS* 3 (1957), 136-142.
- "The Main Literary Problems of the Lucan Infancy Story," *Angl. Theol. Rev.* 40 (1958), 257-264.
- "On the Margin of Luke I, II," *Stud. Theol.* 12 (1958), 65-107.
- "Lukanische Miszellen," *ZNW* 49 (1958), 65-77.
- *On the Trial of Jesus*, Berlin, 1961.
- Wolff, H. W., "Israel und die Völker bei Deuterocesaja," *EMZ* 8 (1951), 1-14.
- Wolfson, H. A., *Philo*, Vol. I-II, Cambridge, Mass., 1962³.
- Wood, H. G., "Interpreting this time," *NTS* 2 (1955-56), 262-266.
- Woude, A. S. van der, *Die Messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân*, Assen, 1957.
- Yadin, Y., "A Midrash on 2 Sam. vii and Ps. i-ii (4QFlorilegium)," *Isr. Expl. Journ.* 9 (1959), 95-98.
- *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*, Oxford, 1962.
- Yaure, L., "Elymas-Nehelamite-Pethor," *JBL* 79 (1960), 297-314.
- Young, J. C. de, *Jerusalem in the New Testament; The Significance of the City in the History of Redemption and in Eschatology*, Kampen, 1960.
- Zimmerli, W., *Ezechiel*, Neukirchen, 1955ff.
- Zeitlin, S., *Who Crucified Jesus?*, New York, 1964².

INDEX AUCTORUM

- Aalen, S. 231
 Abelson, J. 206
 Abrahams, I. 443
 Albertz, M. 76, 82, 473
 Alizon, J. 440
 Allegro, J. M. 124, 151
 Allen, R. 318
 Allo, E. B. 187

 Bacon, B. W. 77, 93, 456, 479
 Baeck, L. 54, 131
 Baillet, M. 126
 Baltzer, K. 366, 367
 Bammel, E. 313, 454, 456
 Bardtke, H. 123
 Barnard, L. W. 160, 222
 Baron, S. W. 108
 Barrett, C. K. 21, 71, 183, 194, 196,
 402, 412, 420
 Barth, G. 93
 Barth, K. 185, 186
 Barth, M. 453
 Bartsch, H. W. 62, 250, 478, 480
 Bauer, W. 71
 Baumgarten, J. M. 121, 123
 Beare, F. W. 76, 90, 239
 Beasley-Murray, G. R. 8, 9, 26, 27,
 47, 51
 Bell, G. K. A. 293
 Bengel, J. A. 434
 Benoit, P. 201, 259
 Bentzen, A. 276, 377, 385
 Bertram, G. 182
 Best, E. 187, 477
 Betz, O. 148, 166, 172, 224, 326,
 423, 466
 Beyer, H. W. 335
 Bickermann, E. 24, 87, 377
 Billerbeck, P. 24, 77, 80, 81, 104,
 107, 111, 112, 114, 148, 211, 225,
 226, 286, 320, 345, 348, 365, 418,
 442, 460, 463, 464, 465, 466, 481
 Black, M. 13, 120, 123, 129, 135,
 137, 143, 155, 247, 363, 375, 381,
 387, 415
 Blass, F. 28, 53, 71, 235
 Blinzler, J. 67, 316
 Bloch, P. 439

 Bonnard, P. 177
 Bonsirven, J. 148
 Boobyer, G. H. 469, 483
 Bornemann, W. 239
 Bornhäuser, K. 55, 248, 293, 353
 Bornkamm, G. 54, 67, 89, 93, 410,
 421
 Bosch, D. 327
 Bousset, W. 3, 20, 104, 111, 121,
 148, 187, 272, 374
 Bowman, J. 124, 133, 135, 150
 Bowman, J. W. 82
 Box, G. H. 265
 Brandon, S. C. F. 4, 142, 345, 425,
 430, 468, 481
 Brandt, W. 133
 Branscomb, B. H. 75, 425
 Braumann, G. 340, 366, 368
 Braun, F. M. 152, 209, 212
 Braun, H. 411
 Brown, J. R. 3
 Brown, R. E. 209, 210
 Brownlee, H. W. 127, 137, 175, 381
 Bruce, F. F. 200, 381, 460, 461,
 466, 472
 Buber, M. 420
 Buchanan, G. W. 85
 Büchler, A. 3, 67, 100, 136, 146
 Büchsel, F. 71, 226, 399
 Bultmann, R. 5, 8, 9, 10, 12, 18,
 28, 41, 65, 66, 68, 69, 71, 73, 77,
 78, 79, 80, 86, 89, 91, 101, 104, 153,
 207, 208, 210, 211, 212, 224, 226,
 227, 236, 249, 250, 258, 265, 268,
 273, 286, 293, 318, 321, 324, 333,
 346, 349, 354, 358, 371, 373, 398,
 412, 413, 416, 446, 447, 452, 469
 Burch, V. 226
 Burkill, T. A. 68, 90, 418, 468, 475,
 477, 480
 Burney, C. F. 314, 344
 Burrows, E. 213, 259
 Burton, E. D. 245
 Busch, F. 8, 42, 51, 452
 Bussmann, W. 246

 Cadbury, H. J. 154, 423
 Cadoux, C. J. 394, 423

- Caird, G. B. 196, 249
 Carmignac, J. 121, 122, 123
 Carrington, P. 56, 446
 Causse, A. 107
 Chamberlain, J. V. 168, 381
 Charles, R. H. 15, 115, 353
 Cheyne, T. K. 106
 Clark, K. W. 3
 Clements, R. E. 174
 Clermont-Ganneau, M. 87
 Coates, J. R. 423, 424
 Cohen, A. 151
 Colani, T. 41
 Cole, A. 66, 71, 81, 158
 Comblin, J. 336, 337
 Congar, Y. M. J. 177
 Conzelmann, H. 8, 19, 25, 50, 51,
 100, 155, 247, 249, 250, 251, 287,
 294, 295, 316, 328, 331, 340, 347,
 349, 364, 366, 367, 368, 369, 373
 Creed, J. M. 246, 294, 349
 Cross, F. L. 239
 Cross, F. M. Jr. 122, 124, 268
 Cullmann, O. 39, 59, 65, 67, 74, 89,
 92, 104, 140, 141, 143, 152, 153,
 155, 159, 166, 208, 209, 211, 223,
 227, 276, 277, 283, 285, 286, 287,
 293, 295, 317, 365, 371, 373, 380,
 384, 389, 391, 416, 423, 425, 428,
 470
 Dabeck, P. 282
 Dahl, N. A. 100, 137, 228, 239,
 295, 302, 308, 416, 417
 Dalman, G. 70, 149, 371, 380
 Danby, H. 99
 Danell, G. A. 338
 Daube, D. 11, 14, 28, 76, 81, 250
 Davies, W. D. 1, 93, 101, 112, 206,
 209, 309, 322, 375
 Debrunner, A. 28, 53, 71, 235
 Deissmann, A. 293
 Delcor, M. 121, 123
 Delling, G. 66, 73, 87, 94, 102
 Dibelius, F. 55
 Dibelius, M. 41, 43, 44, 68, 70, 76,
 199, 257, 260, 305, 310, 313,
 333
 Dickey, S. 423
 Dobschütz, E. von 83
 Dodd, C. H. 14, 31, 50, 51, 58, 68,
 71, 74, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 217,
 221, 248, 249, 293, 329, 348, 358,
 375, 388, 405, 409, 412, 413, 418,
 442, 475
 Doeve, J. W. 34, 409
 Dornseiff, F. 459
 Downing, J. 382
 Drews, A. 277
 Dubarle, A. M. 207, 208
 Duhm, B. 106, 379
 Dunkerley, R. 426
 Duplacy, J. 98, 99
 Dupont, J. 455
 Dupont-Sommer, A. 115, 122, 127
 Easton, B. S. 245, 249, 288
 Ebeling, H. J. 79
 Edlund, C. 323
 Edsman, C. M. 138
 Ehrhardt, A. A. T. 1, 239
 Eisler, R. 4, 159, 423, 425
 Elliger, K. 440
 Ellis, E. E. 185, 322
 Emerton, J. A. 226
 Evans, C. F. 289, 316, 473, 475,
 481, 483, 485
 Farmer, W. R. 424
 Fascher, E. 2
 Feine, P. 244, 245
 Feuillet, A. 175, 484, 486
 Fiebig, P. 286
 Filson, F. V. 87
 Finkelstein, L. 110, 125, 131, 132,
 138, 442
 Fischel, H. A. 291, 382
 Fitzmyer, J. A. 141, 177, 180, 202
 Flender, H. 250, 339, 343, 348, 366,
 368, 388
 Fletcher, W. 45
 Flew, R. N. 66, 416
 Flusser, D. 120, 128, 189, 222
 Foerster, W. 156, 158, 272, 277,
 335
 Fohrer, G. 107
 Ford, J. M. 225
 Fraeyman, M. 176, 180
 Fraidl, F. 462
 Freytag, W. 428, 432
 Friedrichsen, A. 143, 214, 323
 Friedrich, G. 56, 90, 92, 276, 284,
 285, 293, 441, 445
 Fritsch, C. T. 122
 Fuchs, E. 410, 412, 419
 Fuller, R. H. 371, 372, 456

- Gärtner, B. 45, 131, 152, 155, 163,
166, 167, 171, 175, 176, 188, 190,
192, 198, 213, 228
Gaster, M. 278
Gaster, T. H. 121
Gaston, L. 10, 144, 236, 248, 253,
357
Gerhardsson, B. 252, 366, 367
Gils, F. 293, 445
Ginsberg, H. L. 380
Ginzberg, L. 117
Glasson, T. F. 352, 384, 389, 392,
484
Gloege, G. 416
Gnilka, J. 92, 137, 138, 238, 259,
477
Goguel, M. 65, 67, 68, 69, 74, 85,
86, 100, 102, 345, 430, 481
Goppelt, L. 347
Grant, F. C. 247
Grant, R. M. 86, 422
Grässer, E. 59
Gressmann, H. 3, 104, 111, 121,
148, 150, 374
Grundmann, W. 139, 249, 261, 273,
288, 314, 318, 320, 328, 329, 348
Gunkel, H. 265, 362

Haenchen, E. 78, 97, 100, 158, 200,
250, 279, 302, 309, 310, 322, 345,
452
Hahn, F. 92, 276, 283, 296, 297, 384,
389, 429
Hahn, W. 71, 72
Harder, G. 9, 19, 48, 49, 428
Harnack, A. von 44, 248
Harris, J. R. 214, 221
Hastings, A. 366
Heaton, E. W. 377, 385
Hegermann, H. 149
Helfgott, B. W. 3
Hempel, J. 427
Hengel, M. 3, 116, 117, 424, 425,
426, 441, 458, 460, 462, 464
Hennecke, E. 44, 45, 141, 234, 440,
448
Héring, J. 185
Higgins, A. J. B. 137, 250, 348,
350, 352, 372, 484
Hilgert, E. 362
Hölscher, G. 8, 25, 26, 66
Hoffmann, R. A. 65, 69, 72
Holtzmann, H. J.
Hooke, S. H. 175, 218
Hooker, M. D. 380, 431
Hummel, R. 81, 93, 94, 101, 104,
105, 486, 487
Hunt, B. P. W. S. 46
Huppenbauer, H. W. 177, 406

Iersel, B. van 275
Isaksson, A. 239

Jack, J. W. 425
James, M. R. 44
Jeremias, J. 20, 35, 37, 38, 40, 65,
70, 71, 73, 78, 79, 82, 88, 95, 99,
104, 114, 130, 131, 146, 147, 171,
192, 193, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214,
215, 216, 217, 219, 222, 225, 226,
227, 233, 234, 235, 238, 239, 243,
249, 251, 252, 272, 276, 278, 283,
284, 287, 311, 313, 320, 324, 325,
326, 327, 328, 341, 353, 354, 380,
386, 400, 407, 408, 412, 416, 429,
465, 476
Jervell, J. 300, 302, 310, 368, 432
Johannson, N. 382
Jonas, H. 152
Joüon, P. 70
Jülicher, A. 20

Käsemann, E. 93, 184, 250, 373,
404, 410, 419, 433, 441, 447, 448,
454
Käser, W. 364, 365
Kattenbusch, F. 416, 418
Kennard, J. S. 86
Kilpatrick, G. D. 19, 68, 287
King, N. Q. 320
Kittel, G. 24, 206, 214
Kittel, R. 201
Klausner, J. 149, 463
Klein, G. 340
Kleist, J. A. 69
Klijn, A. F. J. 158
Klostermann, E. 8, 23, 28, 39, 65,
74, 85, 91
Knox, J. 373, 410
Knox, W. L. 25, 35, 76, 77, 83, 90,
186, 187, 357
Koh, R. 248, 254
Kohler, K. 132
Kosmala, H. 123, 124, 125, 163, 386
Kraeling, C. H. 138, 139, 374
Kraft, H. 441, 446

- Kramer, W. 296
 Krauss, H. J. 105, 174
 Kümmer, W. G. 9, 19, 49, 51, 65,
 66, 74, 87, 98, 104, 165, 227, 231,
 250, 252, 322, 412, 413, 415, 416,
 417, 422, 454, 468, 482, 486
 Kuhn, K. G. 136, 137, 177, 408

 Laible, H. 481
 Lake, K. 98, 247
 Lampe, G. W. H. 216
 Lane, W. R. 164
 Laurentin, R. 259
 Lauterbach, J. Z. 67, 132
 Leaney, A. R. C. 168, 260, 348,
 382, 395
 Leipoldt, J. 100
 Léon-Dufour, X. 208
 Lévi, I. 109
 Liberty, S. 423, 426
 Lidzbarski, M. 128, 153
 Lietzmann, H. 67, 375
 Lightfoot, J. B. 121, 124
 Lightfoot, R. H. 86, 87, 90, 478,
 481, 482, 483, 485
 Lindars, B. 202, 216, 221, 224, 337,
 389, 472, 484
 Lindblom, J. 218
 Lindeskog, G. 480, 481
 Linton, O. 389
 Loewe, H. 425
 Lohmeyer, E. 9, 10, 18, 19, 28, 29,
 36, 40, 42, 47, 49, 51, 65, 69, 72,
 73, 74, 75, 76, 78, 79, 81, 86, 87, 88,
 89, 91, 94, 95, 100, 101, 102, 103,
 104, 139, 230, 237, 240, 327, 387,
 389, 469, 476, 481, 482
 Lohse, E. 11, 366, 382, 383
 Loisy, A. 46, 416

 Macdonald, J. 133, 278
 MacNeill, H. L. 275
 Macuch, R. 134
 Maier, J. 124, 171
 Mánek, J. 288
 Manson, T. W. 36, 50, 78, 81, 84,
 87, 95, 240, 247, 248, 287, 314,
 320, 321, 322, 328, 329, 348, 349,
 350, 357, 359, 380, 385, 393, 394,
 402, 404, 409, 416, 418, 420, 425,
 472, 483
 Manson, W. 14, 156, 160, 380, 467,
 475
 Mantel, H. 68
 Marti, K. 106
 Martin-Achard, M. 429
 Marxsen, W. 8, 19, 28, 29, 49, 50,
 64, 482
 Masson, C. 188
 Matthiae, K. 295
 May, H. G. 362
 McArthur, H. K. 389
 McCasland, S. V. 465
 McKelvey, R. J. 216
 Meinertz, M. 322
 Mendner, S. 207
 Menoud, P. 247
 Merx, A. J. 27, 150, 278, 363
 Metzger, B. M. 232
 Meyer, A. 314
 Meyer, E. 1
 Meyer, R. 276, 376, 441, 443,
 467
 Michaelis, W. 37, 203, 233, 279
 Michel, O. 65, 104, 112, 180, 183,
 188, 198, 208, 210, 345, 366, 386,
 428, 429, 440, 460, 485
 Milik, J. T. 123, 201, 375
 Moffatt, J. 5
 Montefiore, H. W. 246, 423
 Montgomery, J. A. 133
 Moore, G. F. 1, 68, 77, 112, 136,
 206, 309, 320
 Moule, C. F. D. 5, 102, 154, 239,
 385, 387, 391, 467, 486
 Mowinkel, S. 149, 230, 374
 Münsterlein, G. 474
 Munck, J. 42, 142, 187, 194, 200,
 298, 308, 310, 337, 430, 431
 Mürmelstein, B. 80, 378
 Murphy-O'Connor, J. 197
 Naber, S. A. 120
 Nairne, A. 467
 Nauck, W. 239, 450
 Nepper-Christensen, P. 62, 407
 Nestle, E. 24, 52, 200
 Neusner, J. 1, 3, 151, 424, 460
 Newton, I. 434
 Nineham, D. E. 19, 289
 Noack, B. 347, 348, 349
 Nötscher, F. 165, 178
 Norden, E. 257
 North, C. 175
 Noth, M. 105, 218, 377, 380
 Odeberg, H. 210, 212, 278

- Oepke, A. 66, 74, 100, 101, 227, 387, 416, 417
 Oesterley, W. O. E. 81, 87
 Oliver, H. H. 251
 O'Neill, J. C. 155
 Otto, R. 374, 409, 445
 Owen, H. P. 427
- Parker, P. 247, 248
 Parkes, J. 107
 Parsons, E. W. 245
 Patai, R. 211
 Pedersen, J. 334
 Pedersen, S. 484
 Percy, E. 94, 223
 Perrin, N. 229, 231, 389
 Perry, A. M. 245
 Peterson, E. 408
 Petrie, S. 252
 Pfammatter, J. 177, 182, 183, 187, 190, 192, 198, 214
 Pickl, J. 423
 Piganiol, A. 25, 26
 Plooi, D. 73, 74, 178
 Preiss, T. 391, 405
 Procksch, O. 219
- Quispel, G. 152, 210
- Rabin, C. 202
 Rad, G. von 105, 109, 206, 230, 277, 334, 376, 418, 434
 Rahlfs, A. 116, 200
 Rahmani, I. E. 45, 46
 Ramsey, A. M. 384
 Rau, G. 332
 Rehkopf, F. 249, 252, 253
 Reicke, B. 18, 55, 78, 98, 156, 157, 158, 298, 305, 316, 319, 325
 Reitzenstein, R. 153, 154
 Rengstorff, K. H. 85, 248, 314, 484
 Richardson, A. 209
 Richardson, H. N. 172
 Ridderbos, H. 409
 Riddle, D. W. 480
 Rigaux, B. 187
 Riggenbach, E. 117, 467
 Rissi, M. 15, 196
 Ristow, H. 295
 Robinson, J. A. T. 185, 261, 264, 279, 280, 289, 290, 352, 354, 389, 389
 Rössler, D. 422
- Rordorf, W. 81
 Roth, C. 86
 Rowley, H. H. 137, 380, 409
 Rudolf, K. 152, 154
 Russel, H. G. 248
- Sahlin, H. 97, 191, 192, 239, 247, 248, 254, 259, 260, 262, 264, 266, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 283, 304, 307, 312, 338
 Schäfer, K. T. 79
 Schechter, S. 124, 136
 Schlatter, A. 84, 248, 249, 262, 275, 314, 367, 447
 Schlier, H. 194, 265, 428, 432
 Schmauch, W. 12, 75, 94, 386
 Schmid, J. 51, 147
 Schmidt, C. 44
 Schmidt, K. L. 11, 41, 112, 176, 191, 214, 241, 416, 482
 Schmithals, W. 97, 101, 143, 156, 309
 Schmitz, O. 75, 406
 Schnackenburg, R. 210, 276
 Schneemelcher, W. 44, 45, 141, 234, 440, 448
 Schneider, J. 316
 Schniewind, J. 8, 65, 239
 Schoeps, H. J. 1, 2, 3, 4, 93, 118, 129, 140, 141, 142, 160, 195, 291, 322
 Schreiber, J. 477, 483
 Schrenk, G. 75, 86, 94, 102, 104, 114, 235, 272, 347, 481
 Schürer, E. 130
 Schürmann, H. 455
 Schwartz, E. 35
 Schweitzer, A. 412, 414, 421
 Schweizer, E. 248, 296, 350, 382, 383, 384, 388, 392, 394, 419
 Scobie, C. H. 139
 Seeberg, A. 56
 Seeligmann, I. L. 377, 438, 439
 Seitz, O. J. F. 226
 Seligsohn, M. 130
 Selwyn, E. G. 16, 56, 57, 186, 190, 198, 221, 446, 450
 Sharman, H. B. 245, 423
 Silbermann, L. H. 439
 Simkhovitch, V. G. 423
 Simon, M. 5, 65, 104, 129, 134, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 280
 Sjöberg, E. 87

- Skehan, P. W. 135
 Souček, J. B. 418
 Spadafora, F. 4, 484
 Sperber, A. 167
 Spicq, R. P. 467
 Spitta, F. 245, 248, 357
 Stählin, G. 55, 428, 432
 Staerk, W. 90, 111, 263, 339, 374
 Stauffer, E. 14, 42, 295, 371, 382
 Stendahl, K. 14, 136, 272
 Strack, H. L. 146, 387
 Strathmann, H. 19, 91, 104, 112
 Strauss, D. F. 8
 Strecker, G. 141, 345
 Streeter, B. H. 81, 245, 246
 Strobel, A. 462
 Suggs, M. J. 383
 Sundkler, B. 20, 301

 Taylor, V. 8, 19, 29, 39, 65, 68, 69,
 74, 83, 85, 86, 92, 104, 245, 246,
 251, 253, 283, 287, 288, 320, 380,
 385, 389, 425, 471, 474, 480
 Teeple, H. M. 276, 373
 Thomas, J. 120, 121, 133, 134, 141,
 142, 260
 Thyen, H. 139, 259
 Tödt, H. E. 372, 373, 374, 390, 399,
 404, 455
 Torrey, C. C. 26, 51, 200, 247
 Townsend, J. T. 4, 101, 196
 Trilling, W. 485, 487
 Turner, N. 260
 Tyson, J. B. 249

 Unnik, W. C. van 295

 Vaux, R. de 124, 201
 Vermès, G. 151, 444
 Vielhauer, P. 71, 176, 185, 188, 225,
 250, 258, 260, 261, 265, 371, 373,
 392, 393, 394, 408, 440, 448
 Vincent, A. 108
 Völter, D. 257, 258
 Vogt, E. 272
 Volz, P. 108, 111, 114, 147, 148, 346

 Waard, J. de 202
 Waitz, H. 140
 Wallace, D. H. 120
 Weinreich, O. 465
 Weiss, B. 87, 245, 467
 Weiss, J. 180, 184, 414, 423
 Wellhausen, J. 35, 50, 51, 65, 71,
 84, 321
 Wenschkewitz, H. 71, 75, 81, 87,
 102, 104, 130, 162, 163, 175, 180,
 190, 207
 Wetherall, J. 2
 Wieder, N. 381
 Wikgren, A. 87
 Wilckens, U. 195, 299, 322
 Wilcox, M. 157, 202
 Wilder, A. N. 421
 Williams, C. S. C. 247, 248
 Wilson, R. McL. 260
 Windisch, H. 2, 5, 145, 230, 231,
 431
 Winter, P. 67, 77, 248, 258, 260,
 272, 423
 Wolff, H. W. 429
 Wolfson, H. A. 130
 Wood, H. G. 423
 Woude, A. S. van der, 276, 295

 Yadin, Y. 126, 164, 466
 Yaure, L. 436
 Young, J. C. de 4

 Zahn, T. 200
 Zimmerli, W. 174, 277
 Zeitlin, S. 79

INDEX LOCORUM

I. OLD TESTAMENT

<i>Genesis</i>		17:8	309	23:19	146
1:2	378	17:10	309	24:12f	314
2:24	180	17:12	309	26:13ff	230
7:23	352	17:13	309	30:4	33
9:27	109	17:15	309	32:11	345
10	290	18:26	309	32:39	14
11:32	157	19:18	319	33	42
28:12	210	21:17ff	327		
40-41	436	23:10	80	<i>Joshua</i>	
41:25	440	23:38	122	3:15ff	467
42:23	436	24:5-9	80	6:16	467
44:16	328	26:11f	177, 178	6:26	125
49	42			23	42
50:13	157	<i>Numbers</i>			
		7:1	212	<i>Judges</i>	
<i>Exodus</i>		11:16	290, 318	7:15	436
2:14	290	11:25	392	9	437
3:6	157	12:5	392	13:4f	268
4:22	283	12:6-8	438	14	437
6:14-27	254	12:7	198		
8:15	290	22-24	437	<i>Ruth</i>	
15:17f 127, 128, 163, 164		22:8	436	2:12	345
19:6	132, 238	24:3f	436		
22:25f	314	24:17	460	<i>1 Samuel</i>	
23:20	287	28:9f	81	3	436
24	288, 418, 419			9	436
24:1	290	<i>Deuteronomy</i>		12	42
24:15f	209	1:22ff	289	14:45	22
24:16	470	2:5	157	15:22	122
34:1	318	3:25	459	21:1-7	80
34:5	392	4:1	230		
34:6	209	6-8	283	<i>2 Samuel</i>	
35:29	288	6:17f	230	1:24	364
36:8-38	160	8:3	460	5:8	327
40:34f	271	13:2	35	6:20	289
40:34	209	13:7	33	7:5f	129
40:35	96	18:15-19	276, 277, 293	7:10f	127, 163, 164,
		18:15	157, 267, 279	165	
<i>Leviticus</i>		280, 283, 288		7:11-14	128, 164, 165
10:9	268	18:19	302	166, 167, 174	
13-14	90	23:2f	164	7:11	129, 173
16	113	23:5	436	7:13f	271

7:13	128, 147	21	235	102:17	188
7:14	177, 178, 179	26:11	195	107:3	344
7:16	271	30:4	460	107:18	224
12	437	33:23	436	110:1	80, 89, 90, 385
14:11	22	38:6	195		389, 390, 391
		38:9	215	110:4	89
1 <i>Kings</i>		38:17	224	114:1-3	362
8:10f	209	42:9	226	114:2	174
11:29ff	441			116:3	15
17:17-24	286	<i>Psalms</i>		118:20	234
19:15f	441	2:1-2	230, 281	118:22	189, 215, 216,
19:16	295	2:2	167, 333		217, 218, 221, 222,
19:19-21	289	2:7	167, 282, 283		223, 228, 229, 243,
21:17	441	8:6-7	378		400
		9:14	224	118:24	222
2 <i>Kings</i>		15	230	118:26	217, 346
1	289	16:10	282	144:7	362
1:10	289	17:8	345		
1:12	289	18:10	392	<i>Proverbs</i>	
2:4	441	22	216, 480	1:6	438
4:32-37	286	24	230	9:1	195
25:1f	360	24:7	215	15:8	123
		28:5	188		
1 <i>Chronicles</i>		36:7	345	<i>Ecclesiastes</i>	
16:36	149	37:23f	173	8:1	438
17:7-14	231	46	106	12	437
		46:2f	106		
2 <i>Chronicles</i>		46:3	362	<i>Song of Solomon</i>	
4:9	99	46:5	106	1:5	364
13:22	439	48:3	95, 106	4:16	148
15:6	14	49:5	438		
24:20ff	322	51:17	108	<i>Isaiah</i>	
24:27	439	51:18f	108	1:7-9	346
29:12ff	112	57:1	345	1:7	361
34:3ff	113	61:4	345	1:10-17	108
36:21	376	63:7	345	1:25	139
		69	86, 480	2:1ff	106
<i>Ezra</i>		69:9	206	2:1	436
3:2-6	108	69:10	86	2:2-4	335
7:6	439	74	379	2:3	170, 301
7:10	439	74:9	443	3:16	364
8:15ff	108	75:4	195	3:26	360
9:3	24	78	438	4:3	265
		80:9ff	312	4:4	139
<i>Nehemiah</i>		82:	378	5	437
8:8	439	89	379	5:1-7	342
13:4-9	113	90:10	465	5:3	361
		90:15	465	6:9f	212, 477
<i>Esther</i>		91:4	345	6:10	337
10:31	113	93:3	362	7:25	361
		94:2	169	8:14f	217, 218, 221,
<i>Job</i>		95	467		222
9:6	195	98:7f	362	8:14	174, 189, 224

8:18	418	40:3	294	53:12	383
9:1	265	40:8	376	53:13	266
9:2-7	335	40:27ff	379	54:1-10	364
9:5	289	41:4	14	54:11ff	175, 190
10:5-19	362	41:21-26	379	55:3ff	379
10:6	361	41:25	148	55:3	282
10:15	377	42:1	283, 288, 312	55:10f	376
10:23	377	42:6	274	56:1-8	429
10:25	377	42:7	438	56:7	86, 88, 106
10:28-11:14	151	43:44	382	57:19	302
10:29	377	43:10	161	58:6-12	314
10:34	150, 151, 459, 460, 464	43:13ff	14	58:12	361
11:1-5	116	43:22-24	109	59:17f	446
11:1	150, 464	43:23f	106	60	106, 109
13: -14:23	32	43:26	14	61:1f	313
13:10	32f	43:27	436	61:1	283, 286, 295
14	377	44:6-8	379	61:2	284
14:4-20	437	44:26	361	61:18ff	106
14:13f	187	44:28	106	62:4	107
16:4	361	45:1	105, 148, 379	62:12	107
17:12ff	106	45:14	106	63:1ff	446
17:12	362	45:21	202, 203	63:18	361
19:2	14, 15	45:22	203	64:10	361
22:22	226	45:23	106, 379, 419	66:1-6	108, 109, 158
24-27	106	47	379	66:1	95, 129
26:1-4	230	48:10	169, 381	66:7	15
26:3	168	49:1	431	66:19f	432
28	193	49:4	431		
28:16ff	175, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 226, 227, 228	49:6	267, 274, 431	<i>Jeremiah</i>	
28:16	171, 189, 190, 197, 215, 216, 218, 219, 243	49:8	431	1:10	182, 188
29:3	360	50:7	222	1:18	194
29:8	106	51:1f	225	2:12	24
29:13	108	51:1	195	2:21	312
29:18f	286	51:3	361	3-6	439
31:5	345	51:9f	379	3:15ff	109
33:10f	385	52:7-10	413	3:17	106, 107
33:14-16	230	52:7	337	6:6-8	359
33:21	106	52:9f	273, 337	6:8	346
34-35	106	52:9	361	6:20	108
34:1-17	32	52:11	177	7	108, 109
34:4f	32, 33	52:13ff	383	7:11	85
34:16	439	52:13	380	7:33	353
35:5f	286	52:14	379	7:34	117, 361
37:33	360	52:15	337	8:11	359
38:10	224	53	169, 380, 381, 382, 383, 387, 399, 401, 431	8:18	359
40:1f	107	53:1	337	8:23	359
40:2	226	53:2-4	383	8:34	442
40:3-5	414	53:3	400	11:15	108
		53:5	337	12:7	346
		53:8	270	12:15	202
		53:11	380	12:16	188
				13:27	24
				14-15	359

18:7-10	427, 428	11:16	174	4	436
18:9f	431	11:23	12	4:8	440
18:9	182	15:1ff	312	4:21	440
18:16	24	17:2	437	5	436
20:4f	361	17:5ff	312	5:11	440
21:7	361	17:20ff	106	5:12	430
22:5ff	346	18:5-7	230	5:18ff	378
23:5	264	19:1off	312	5:26	449
23:25-28	436	20:34	177	7	31, 34, 62, 169,
24:6	188	21:5	437		293, 296, 374-381,
25:11ff	376, 444	21:22	360		384, 387, 390, 391,
25:11	361	22:20ff	139		392, 395, 397, 399,
25:18	361	23:38	124		401, 406, 408, 413,
25:29	198	24:3	437		418, 435, 477
26	109	26:8f	360	7:2-7	377
26:10	361	26:16	24	7:8	377
26:17-19	427	26:19	362	7:9	406
26:21	36	27:35	24	7:1of	379
27:17	36	28:2	187	7:10	31, 33
27:27	36	33:24	361	7:11	377
27:3	36	33:27	361	7:13f	31, 33, 35, 62,
29:10	376, 444	36:10	361		385, 386, 387, 395,
30:21	459	36:25f	139, 211		405, 407, 460, 485
31	418, 419	36:25	108	7:13	334, 375, 381,
31:4	188	37	420		387, 388, 389, 390,
31:8	148	37:26-28	174		404, 408, 409
32:35	34	37:27	177, 178	7:14	77, 80, 118, 231,
33:7	188	38:39	106		379, 380, 381, 395,
33:16	107	38:17	439		419
35	129	39:8	439	7:18	391
41:5	108	40ff	107, 109, 126	7:19-25	403
42:10	188	40:2	106, 107	7:20-22	377
44:2	361	43:6-12	148	7:21f	380
44:6	361	44:4	209	7:21	380
44:22	24, 361	44:15	124	7:22	381, 390, 404,
51:26	215	44:22	239		409
52:4f	360	45:18ff	113	7:24-25	377
52:12	462	47	106, 107, 211	7:25	118, 362, 379,
		48:35	107		380
<i>Lamentations</i>				7:26	391
2:8	361	<i>Daniel</i>		7:27	118, 391, 406
4:20	272	1-6	376, 382, 434, 435	7:28	393
		1-17	28	8-12	376, 380, 435
<i>Ezekiel</i>		2	460	8	377, 460
4:1-3	360	2:18-23	440	8:11ff	460
4:5	466	2:19	440	8:11	118
5:9	24	2:21-23	28	8:13	361, 362
5:14	361	2:28-30	440	8:14	119, 175
6:9	24	2:28	14, 15, 444	8:24f	118
9:6	198	2:34ff	219	8:24	379
9:23	209	2:34	222	9	376, 377, 440, 468
10	345	2:37f	379	9:2	361
11	24	2:44	118, 379, 381	9:4-19	873

9:24-27	461, 462	4:4	108	2	33
9:24	118, 175	5:4	108	2:10	23
9:25	28	5:5	361	2:14f	309
9:26f	362	5:21ff	108	3:8	265
9:26	118, 151, 460	5:25-27	157	4:6	149
9:27	23, 24, 118, 128, 460	5:26	167	4:7-10	215
11	376, 377, 379	5:27	361	4:7	149
11:30ff	461	6:14	361	6:9ff	149
11:31	23, 24, 118, 460	7:11	361	6:12f	149, 265
11:33	118, 379	7:17	361	8:3	107
11:35	119, 169, 381	8:2	36	8:19	79
11:36	377	8:9f	480	8:20ff	106
11:41	22	9:1	108, 361	9:14	472
11:44	14, 15	9:4	361	9:9f	335
12:1-3	420	9:11f	200-204	9:9	34, 334, 364, 474
12:1	22, 26	9:11	128, 164, 166, 167	9:11	34
12:2	379, 380			9:14	34
12:3	28, 119, 378, 444	<i>Jonah</i>		9:16	34
12:10	119	3:4	427	10:3	34, 335
12:11f	457	3:10	427	10:4	34
12:11	22, 23, 24, 460			10:8	34
12:12	21, 22	<i>Micah</i>		11:1	151, 465
12:13	12	1:1	436	12:14	106
<i>Hosea</i>		1:7	146	12:2-3	34
5:8-6:3	293	4:1ff	106, 335	12:3	361
6:1-3	420	4:2	301	12:10	34, 387, 484
6:2	415	4:11	106	13:1	34
6:6	81, 78, 108	5:5	335	13:2-5	443
8:1	353	6:6-8	108	13:7	34, 482
9:7	361	7:6	21, 326, 455	13:9	34, 139
9:10	312	7:7	270	14	12, 86, 474
10:1	312	7:10	361	14:2	34
10:8	364		361	14:4	475
		<i>Habakkuk</i>		14:5	34
<i>Joel</i>		1:5	308	14:8	34, 106, 211
1:7	312	2:6	438	14:10	106
2-4	31, 32	2:9-11	126	14:16-19	474
2:1	32	2:11	359	14:16	34
2:2-11	32	3:13	270	14:20f	474
2:10	32			14:21	86
2:16	32	<i>Zephaniah</i>		<i>Malachi</i>	
2:18-27	32	1:15	361	1:6-2:3	113
3	106	3:10	106	1:10	113, 125
4:13	32			1:11	113
4:15	32	<i>Haggai</i>		3:1ff	113
4:18	106	2:23	149	3:1	82, 264, 266, 287, 290, 303
4:19	32	<i>Zechariah</i>		3:3	139
<i>Amos</i>		1:6	376	3:19	139
1:1	436	1:7	436	3:23f	266
3:11	361			3:23	403
				3:24	269, 290, 326

2. APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

1 <i>Maccabees</i>		24:10	209	17:46	116
1:38	24	28:2	226	18:5	116
1:54	118	36:14	109		
1:59	24	39:1-3	438	<i>Sibylline Oracles</i>	
2:23ff	25	46:1	297	III, 316	274
2:28	25	48:9f	267, 269	III, 611	353
3:45	24, 361	48:10	290	III, 657	111
4:36ff	113	49:7	188	III, 663	106
4:46	150	49:16	378	III, 725f	111
4:48	118	51:12h	263	III, 772ff	106
4:60	361			IV, 24-30	134
9:27	433	<i>Baruch</i>		IV, 117ff	116, 460
		2:3	358	IV, 165f	134
2 <i>Maccabees</i>		5	114	IV, 172	484
7:37f	283			IV, 175f	134
10:1ff	113	<i>Jubilees</i>		V, 158	484
		1:10	115	V, 414	148
4 <i>Maccabees</i>		1:17	110	V, 420ff	148
6:29	383	1:26-28	110	V, 432f	148
17:21f	383	4:26	110	VI, 26-28	484
		23:21	15		
<i>Tobit</i>		23:22ff	106	<i>Assumption of Moses</i>	
13:9-18	106, 110	25:21	110	1:18	335
14:5	109, 110	30:14f	115	2:8	115
		50:10f	81	3:1f	115
<i>Judith</i>				4:8	115
12:7f	132	<i>Ethiopian Enoch</i>		5:3f	115
		37-71	375	6:1	115
<i>Wisdom of Solomon</i>		56	106	7:3-10	320
(<i>Sap Sol</i>)		80:2	26	10:8f	383
2:10ff	383	89-90	119	10:8	353
3:1-8	383	89:73	114, 476		
3:7	383	90	119	<i>Syriac Baruch</i>	
3:13	383	90:21f	114	1:4	363
3:18	383	90:28f	114, 147	4:1	363
5:1-8	383	91:13	110	5:1	363
5:17ff	446	99:5	21	6-7	358
10:1	378	100:2	21	6:9	363
12:7	383			8	117
12:20	383	<i>Psalms of Solomon</i>		8:2	345
14:11	335	1:8	115	10:10	116
16:13	224	2:3	115	12:3	363
19:6	383	8:13	115, 125	13:5ff	363
19:15	335	8:23	115	20:1f	363
		16:2	224	20:1	26
<i>Wisdom of Jesus Sirach</i>		17:22	361	20:2	116, 335
(<i>Sir</i>)		17:24	116	25:3	363
18:29	437	17:25	116	27:2	363
23:14	289	17:26f	116	27:6	363
24:4	195	17:30	116	27:7	363
24:8	209	17:36	116, 272	27:9	363

29	363	4 <i>Ezra</i>		<i>Testament of Dan</i>	
30	364	4:26	26	5	114
31	364	5:23	312		
32	364	6:2	21		
32:4	10	9:44f	270	<i>Testament of Levi</i>	
59:8	12	10	147	10	12
68:6	109	11f	353	16:1	115
82:2	364	13	106, 374	18	114
		13:3	387		
3 <i>Ezra</i>		5 <i>Ezra</i>		<i>Testament of Solomon</i>	
3:1ff	434	1:28ff	344	22:7-23:3	216

3. QUMRAN LITERATURE

CD		XX, 13-16	466	IX, 4	122
I, 3	125	XX, 22-24	124	IX, 12	381
I, 5ff	466	XX, 22	125	IX, 21	381
I, 7	166, 335				
III, 19	173, 227	1QS		1QSa	
III, 21 - IV, 2	124	I, 12	172	I, 1-3	170
IV, 7	166	I, 16	230	I, 12	197
IV, 17f	123	II, 16	326	II, 3-10	327
IV, 18	125	III, 3	381	II, 11-12	137
V, 6f	123	III, 4-9	136		
V, 6	125	III, 14	335	1Q Sb	
VI, 1	295	III, 18	335	III, 2	335
VI, 11ff	121, 123, 129	IV, 6	335	IV, 24-26	241
VI, 11-14	125	IV, 11	335		
VI, 14f	177	IV, 20f	137	1QH	
VI, 16	125	IV, 20	335	I, 17	335
VI, 20	123	IV, 21	108, 211	III, 27ff	138
VII, 6f	123	IV, 26	335	VI, 24-28	171, 172, 224
VII, 9	335	V, 3	226	VI, 25	197
VII, 14-19	166, 167	V, 5-7	170-171	VI, 26f	219, 220
VII, 16	201	V, 5	197	VI, 26	190
VII, 18	166, 444	V, 7ff	230	VI, 27f	226
VII, 21	335	V, 20ff	230	VII, 8-9	171, 172, 220
VIII, 2f	335	VI, 10	168	VIII, 6-8	381
VIII, 3ff	127	VI, 13ff	230	VIII, 10-12	381
VIII, 11	127	VI, 21-23	226	VIII, 23-27	381
IX, 13f	122	VII, 2	168	XIII, 10	335
XI, 17f	122	VII, 17	173, 197	XIII, 18	381
XI, 18-21	123	VII, 22	168	XIV, 24	335
XII, 1f	123	VIII, 1-10	168-170,	XIV, 25	381
XII, 2	125	171, 172		XVII, 26	381
XIII, 7	381	VIII, 4-10	189		
XIII, 13	226	VIII, 5	176	1QM	
XVI, 13f	123	VIII, 7f	219, 220	I, 3	126
XIX, 6	335	VIII, 9	176, 197	II, 3	126
XIX, 10-15	335	VIII, 12f	121	II, 5f	126
XIX, 11	335	IX, 3-6	170, 171, 209	III, 11	126
XX, 7f	381	IX, 3f	176, 197	VII, 4	126

XI, 7	295	XII, 2	152	<i>IQpIs^a</i>	
XII, 1	381	XII, 7f	125	I, 2	151
XII, 17	126			I, 7	151
<i>IQpHab</i>		<i>4QFlor</i>		I, 11	151
II, 3-4	440	I, 1-13	127, 163-168	III, 2	151
III, 11	353		170, 179	III, 7	151
V, 4-6	169	I, 4	191, 226	III, 8	152
VII, 1-5	439	I, 6	173, 227		
VII, 4f	444	I, 10	173	<i>4QpIs^b</i>	
VIII, 2	126	I, 12	201, 202	II, 2	335
VIII, 8-13	123	<i>4QTest</i>			
IX, 4f	123, 125	I, 22-30	125	<i>4QpIs^a</i>	175, 190, 219
IX, 7	127			<i>4QpNah</i>	
IX, 12 - X, 5	127	<i>4QpPs</i> 37		I, 3	127
X, 10	125	II, 7-9	466	I, 11f	127
XII, 2f	127	III, 15f	173, 227		

4. NEW TESTAMENT

<i>Matthew</i>		7:24	215	11:11	233, 409
3:12	36	8:1-9	248	11:12	232, 235
4:15	483	8:11f	232, 426	11:14	262
5:1ff	12	8:11	238, 324	11:19	409
5:5	426	8:12	233	11:25-30	322
5:9	426	8:34	248	11:28	426
5:10-12	421	9:8	78, 397	12:1-8	81
5:11f	449, 450	9:13	78, 81, 89, 95,	12:6	89, 95, 240,
5:11	19, 472		426	241	
5:13f	4	9:37	37	12:28	21
5:18	38, 75, 79	10	18, 19, 20, 22, 454,	12:39ff	36
5:19	447		486	12:40	400
5:20	232	10:1	406	12:41	411
5:21-26	94, 426	10:5f	433	12:45	322
5:23f	94, 95	10:7	409	13:30	36
5:25f	340, 341	10:9f	429	13:36	33
5:26	38	10:10	239	13:39	36
5:34f	95	10:17-23	16, 17, 455	13:40	37
5:38ff	426	10:17	472	13:41	233
5:41	314	10:18	19	13:43	233
5:43ff	426	10:23	18, 38, 409,	13:49	37
5:44	450		414, 451-455, 486	15:19	233
5:47	314	10:25	236, 241	15:20	93
6:13	33	10:28-33	421	16:2f	340
6:14	95	10:32f	447	16:13 — 17:23	248
7:4	70	10:34	274	16:13	372
7:7f	234	10:37f	421	16:17-19	223-227,
7:12	232	10:38f	472		241, 416
7:13f	234	10:39	19	16:17	402, 417
7:15	29	10:41	445	16:18	173, 176, 195,
7:19	312	11:4ff	36		214, 215
7:22f	447	11:10	287	16:19	78, 235, 405
7:22	19	11:11ff	411	16:23	224

16:27	409	23:39	451-455	1:2	262, 287
16:28	350	24-25	60, 455	1:4	88, 138
17:9-13	403	24	22, 483, 484, 486	1:5	88
17:13	262	24:3	44	1:6	262
17:20	84	24:4	44	1:14f	413
17:24-27	101	24:5	44	1:15	241, 409, 412
18:3	232	24:9-14	17, 22	1:16-39	90
18:4	233	24:9	22	1:21 — 3:6	76, 251
18:8-9	232	24:13	22	1:24	92, 266, 294
18:14	37	24:14	20	1:40-45	90, 91
18:15-18	226	24:15	22, 23, 28, 484	1:44	94
18:18	78, 226, 405	24:22	26	2:1-3:6	76, 82, 397
18:20	96, 240	24:23	44	2:1-12	77, 78, 240
18:35	37	24:26	29	2:5	411
19:9	239	24:27	44	2:10	80, 394, 397,
19:17	233	24:29	484	405	
19:23f	232	24:30	44, 346, 387, 484	2:15-17	78, 79
19:28	325, 406, 407	24:32f	44	2:17	238
20:1-15	237	24:33	59	2:18-20	79
20:21	409	24:42	40	2:19	238
20:28	409	24:43	59	2:23-28	79-81
21:5	474	24:45-51	237	2:27f	86
21:9	357	24:45	40	2:28	240, 394, 397
21:14	99, 102, 327	25	484	411	
21:28-31	237	25:1-12	237	3:6	77, 477
21:31	38, 232	25:5f	41	3:13f	12
21:32	139	25:10	233	3:15	405
21:43 231, 237, 241, 476		25:13	37, 40, 59	3:20-21	83
22:1-10	237, 327	25:14-30	237	3:22-30	83
22:3	78	25:14	40	3:24f	236
22:7	484	25:21	233	3:27	36, 236
22:11-13	237	25:23	233	3:28f	324
22:13	233	25:31-46	405	3:30	28
22:35	315	25:31	33, 34	3:31-35	83
23-25	323	25:34	233	4	41, 477
23	60, 320, 345, 455,	25:46	233	4:1-9:40	251
	484, 486, 487	26:28	88	4:2	86
23:13	232, 235	26:52	426	4:9	37, 86
23:16-21	94	26:61	66, 70, 72	4:10	11
23:20-22	95	26:64	389	4:11	86, 233
23:21	95, 96	27:2	18	4:12	477
23:23	321	27:25	486	4:13	86
23:26	321	27:40	67	4:21	86
23:27f	140	28:16-20	12, 484, 485,	4:23	37
23:29-36	456	486		4:24	86
23:31	321	28:18-20	385, 386, 429	4:26-34	251
23:34-39	322	28:18	77, 405	4:26	86
23:34	454	28:19f	433	4:29	36
23:35	322	28:19	43	4:30	86
23:36	486	28:20	42, 46, 240	5:1ff	91
23:37-39	244			5:20	91
23:37	344, 450	Mark		5:21-24	83
23:38	345	1:1	481, 482	5:25-34	83

5:27f	91	9:12	217, 267, 399,	12:13-37	76
5:30f	91		472	12:13-17	82, 89, 473
5:35-43	83	9:19	322	12:13	77
5:37	12	9:28	11	12:18-27	82, 89, 473
6:4	18	9:31	395, 398-400,	12:28-34	82, 89, 473
6:6	477		470, 472	12:34	233
6:7	405	9:35	470	12:35-37	82, 89, 90,
6:11	19	9:37	86, 470		473
6:14-16	288	9:39-42	470	12:35	102
6:15	285	9:43-48	232, 233, 470	12:38-40	82, 473
6:45-8:26	251	9:50	28	12:38	86
7	92, 93	10:7f	180	12:41-44	94
7:1-23	76	10:10	11	13	6, 65, 357, 370,
7:1-2	92	10:11	86		430, 433, 447, 448,
7:3-4	28	10:13-52	251		453, 477, 478, 479,
7:5-8	92	10:15	232		480, 483
7:11	28	10:17	233	13:1-4	10-13, 66
7:13	235	10:23-25	232	13:1	73
7:14ff	146	10:28-30	471	13:2	24, 46, 64, 65,
7:14	86	10:32-34	398-400		66, 67, 72, 73, 242,
7:15	92, 93, 102, 141	10:32	482		244, 365, 424, 479
7:17	11, 93	10:33f	470, 472	13:3-4	46, 63
7:18f	93	10:33	471	13:4	46, 50
7:19	28	10:34	472	13:5-13	62
7:20-23	93	10:35-45	401, 471	13:5-8	13-16, 37, 62
7:24-30	92	10:38	288	13:5f	29, 30
7:36	91	10:39f	421	13:5	52, 54, 58
8:12	322	10:39	421	13:6	19, 30, 52, 63
8:15	323	10:45	383, 395,	13:7	39, 49, 52, 58
8:27f	285, 469		401-402, 471, 472	13:8	39, 49, 52, 58
8:27	372	11:1-15:40	76	13:9-13	16-23
8:31	217, 241, 398-	11:12	76, 81, 82	13:9	13, 16, 30, 52,
	400, 395, 469, 470,	11:1-11	82, 473		58, 63, 452, 472,
	472	11:9f	217, 357		478
8:34-9:1	452, 469	11:12-14	82, 312, 342	13:10	43, 49
8:34-38	52, 53, 421	11:15-17	76, 81-88,	13:11-13	421
8:34f	472		94, 117, 206, 473	13:11	52, 324, 472
8:34	51, 86, 411	11:17	102, 241, 429	13:13	39, 58, 60, 472
8:35	351, 472	11:18f	82, 473	13:14-20	23-29, 52, 56
8:38	33, 322, 403-405	11:20-25	82	13:14-19	61, 62, 64
	409, 447	11:25	95	13:14-18	14, 52
9-10	398, 470	11:27-12:44	251	13:14	49, 50, 51, 53,
9:1	38, 86, 195, 349,	11:27-33	76, 82, 83,		63, 94, 357
	350, 409, 412, 451-		88, 89, 473	13:15-16	61
	455, 472	11:27	102	13:17	49
9:2ff	12, 470	11:31	139	13:18	36
9:2	12	11:32	445	13:19	31, 32, 49, 52
9:5	241	12-13	323	13:20	30, 49, 62, 454
9:9-13	402-403	12:1-11	82, 237, 473,	13:21-23	29-30, 37, 49
9:9f	420		476	13:21f	62
9:9	399	12:9	217	13:21	49, 58
9:11-13	262	12:10f	214, 217, 400	13:22	50, 52
9:11	11	12:12	82, 88, 474	13:23	13, 52, 58, 63, 478

13:24-27	26, 30-35, 37, 51, 52, 56, 62, 147, 452	186, 188, 206, 208, 227, 241, 242, 370, 401, 415, 480	I:41-80	257	
13:24	49, 53, 480, 483	I4:62	I4, 33, 210, 388-390, 391, 392, 394, 403, 455, 478, 480	I:41	444
13:26	49, 270, 384, 385, 388, 390, 392, 403, 478, 480	I5:1	68, 400, 478	I:44	276, 268
13:27	30, 49	I5:2	389	I:46-55	255, 258, 260, 269-270
13:28-30	35-38, 63	I5:10	400	I:47	268, 276, 297
13:28-29	58	I5:15	400	I:48	276
13:29	40	I5:21	314	I:52-54	313
13:30	39, 322, 451- 455	I5:29f	480	I:54	257, 276, 281
13:31-32	38-39, 63	I5:29	66, 68, 72, 236, 241, 401	I:55	276, 302, 312, 329
13:32f	478	I5:33	480	I:56	255
13:32	40, 46, 50, 415	I5:37-39	480, 481	I:57-66	255, 257, 260
13:33-37	39-41, 59, 23, 63, 324	I6:1-8	479, 482	I:64	257, 259
13:33	13, 52, 59,	I6:4	28	I:67	257, 444
13:34	52	I6:7	482, 483	I:68-79	255, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262- 266, 267, 268, 272, 336
13:35	52, 59, 63	I6:8	28, 481	I:68	276, 286, 292, 297, 360
13:37	30, 37, 52, 53, 59, 60, 63, 325	I6:15	43	I:69	275, 276, 281, 297
14-16	372, 398, 475	I6:16	21	I:70	267
14:1	470	I6:17f	46	I:71	21, 257, 276, 297
14:1-2	83	<i>Luke</i>		I:73	276, 312, 329
14:3-9	83, 315	I-2	96, 244, 250, 254, 256-276, 282, 340	I:74	257
14:9	28	I	139	I:76	250, 257, 269, 275
14:10-12	83	I:1-4	247, 258	I:77	276, 297
14:10f	400	I:5-4:30	251	I:78	275, 286
14:17	478	I:5-3:7	247	I:79	257, 290, 326
14:18	405	I:5-80	258	I:80	255, 260
14:20f	478	I:5-45	260	2:1-20	255, 260
14:21	399	I:5-25	255, 257	2:1-3	258
14:25	233, 238, 418	I:5	253	2:1f	253
14:27f	482	I:8ff	96	2:4-21	258
14:27	399, 478	I:8f	275	2:4	272
14:30	478	I:9	366	2:10-11	271-273, 276, 297
14:33	12	I:13	269	2:11	275, 276, 294, 296, 338
14:35	478	I:14-17	262, 268-269	2:14	256, 258, 271- 273, 276, 336
14:38	40, 478	I:14	276	2:21-40	255
14:41	314, 399, 478	I:17	250, 262, 287	2:22-38	96, 258, 260, 366
14:42	400	I:18	269	2:25f	273
14:44	400	I:21f	275, 366	2:25	257, 274, 301, 313, 444
14:49	102, 399	I:26-38	255	2:26	272, 275, 296
14:55-64	68, 69	I:26	257	2:28-34	96, 258
14:56	68, 69	I:32f	256, 270-271, 276, 336	2:28	259
14:57-59	65	I:32	268, 275, 286	2:29-32	258, 273-274
14:58	6, 12, 65, 66, 67, 69, 71, 72, 74, 102, 104, 105, 128, 150, 152, 153, 154, 160, 161, 176, 183,	I:35	96, 268, 271, 294		
		I:39-45	255		

2:29	276	5:24	396	9:51—18:14	245,
2:30-32	301	6:5	396		249, 251, 289
2:30	276, 297	6:12—8:3	251	9:51-62	255
2:31f	311	6:12-49	317	9:51-56	288, 317
2:32	311, 323	6:12	255	9:51	253, 289, 296,
2:34-35	258, 273-274,	6:17	316		316, 343, 348, 368
	290, 313, 340	6:19	255, 313	9:52	266
2:34	218, 319	6:20-49	255, 313-314	9:54	289, 318
2:36	444	6:22f	421, 449, 450	9:58	372, 396, 409
2:37f	275	6:22	19, 21, 396, 472	9:61f	289
2:37	96	6:27ff	354	9:62	409
2:38	257, 274, 276,	6:38	252	10:1-24	255, 318-319
	292, 297, 301, 313,	6:42	70	10:1	290
	360	6:48	215	10:16	472
2:40	21	7:1-49	317	10:19	406
2:41-51	96, 255, 258	7:1-10	255, 286	10:21-24	402
2:46f	100	7:1	313, 316	10:25-37	255, 319
2:46	366	7:5f	314	10:25-28	252
3:1-22	311-312	7:9	315, 319	10:25	233, 315
3:1-3	255	7:11-17	255, 284, 286,	10:30-37	317
3:1f	246, 253		287, 313	10:33ff	426
3:3	253	7:11	316	10:37	37
3:4-16	255	7:16	263, 268, 285,	10:38—11:13	256
3:6	297		336	10:38-42	319
3:7—8:3	245	7:18-35	255, 286-287	11:1-13	319
3:8	329, 343	7:19	346	11:5-8	60, 237
3:9	94	7:22	313	11:9f	234
3:16f	134	7:26	445	11:14-52	256
3:16	253	7:28	233	11:14-23	319
3:17-20	255	7:29f	315	11:17f	235
3:19f	252	7:31-35	322	11:17	359
3:21-22	255	7:31	322	11:20	21, 36, 290
3:21	287	7:33	268	11:22	446
3:22	254	7:34	396	11:24-26	319
3:23-38	253, 255	7:36-50	252, 255, 315-	11:26	411
4:1-13	255		316	11:27f	319
4:1	254	7:39	285	11:29-32	36, 319, 322
4:9	366	8:1-3	255, 317	11:29	252
4:15	283	8:1	316	11:30	396
4:16-30	252, 255, 283-	8:3	253, 288	11:33-36	323
	285, 286, 312-313,	8:4—9:50	251	11:37—12:1	60
	317	8:19-21	252	11:37-52	320-321
4:16	102	8:48	316	11:37	315
4:18	295, 313	9:1	406	11:39	318
4:24	291, 449	9:7-9	253, 255, 288,	11:42	318
4:25	319		333	11:45	315
4:27	319	9:22, 26	396	11:46	315
4:30	316	9:28-36	255, 288, 317	11:47-51	450
4:31—6:11	251	9:31	296, 316, 330,	11:49-51	321-322, 344
4:44	316		368	11:52	235, 315
5:1	316	9:35	283, 293	11:53	315, 323
5:1-11	252, 255, 317	9:44	253, 296	12:1	252, 323
5:20f	316	9:51—19:27	316	12:2-53	256, 323-326

12:2-12	60	13:31-33	243, 290, 367	17:25	322
12:2-3	323	13:31	315, 333	17:26	396
12:4-12	421	13:32	415	17:30	396
12:7	22	13:33	294, 316, 449	17:31	25, 27
12:8f	372, 403, 404, 411	13:34-35	244, 290, 322, 344-347, 455	17:33	19, 472
12:8	396	13:34	343, 368, 450	17:34f	274
12:10	252, 331, 396	13:35	217	18:1-8	60, 353, 451
12:11f	17, 18, 20	14:1-24	256, 327-328	18:8	396
12:11	472	14:1	315	18:9-14	256, 319
12:12	21	14:3	315	18:10-13	94
12:13-15	290	14:7-10	237	18:10	366
12:15	313	14:14-22	252	18:14	38
12:21	37, 313	14:15	238	18:15-43	251
12:22-34	60	14:16-24	237	18:17	232
12:32	231, 241, 406	14:24	38	18:24f	232
12:33f	313	14:25-35	256	18:31	396
12:35-48	60	14:26f	421	19:1-48	251
12:35-40	40, 237, 340, 351	14:27	452, 472	19:1-28	245
12:37	40, 59	14:33	313	19:1-10	256, 329
12:38	41	15:1-32	256, 411	19:9	297, 302, 312, 343
12:39	59	15:1f	328	19:10	396
12:40	396	15:7	38	19:11-27	256, 329, 354-355
12:41	60	15:10	38	19:11	368
12:42-46	237	15:11-32	237	19:14	263
12:49-53	289-290	16:1-31	256	19:29-36	252
12:49f	352	16:1-8	237	19:37-48	256, 355-364
12:50	288	16:9	233	19:37f	338
12:51f	339	16:10-13	313	19:37	331
12:51	274	16:12-19	252	19:38	346
12:52f	21	16:14	328	19:39-44	244
12:54-13:35	256, 327	16:15	319, 328	19:42-44	339
12:54-13:9	339-343, 347	16:16-18	328	19:42	336, 353
12:58f	426	16:16	232, 235, 250	19:44	12, 66, 244, 336, 445
13	83	16:17	38	19:45f	252
13:1f	354	16:19-31	329	19:47	102, 332, 366
13:5	361	16:22	343	19:48	331
13:6-9	83, 312, 447	17	325	20:1-21:4	251
13:10-17	343	17:1-19	256, 329	20:16	37
13:16	302, 312, 329	17:1-2	252	20:18	214, 222
13:18-21	343	17:6	84, 252, 475	21:5-24:49	251
13:18f	252	17:7-10	237	21:5-38	10, 19, 21, 22, 355-364, 368
13:23-30	343-344, 347	17:12-19	313, 317	21:5-7	10, 256
13:24	234	17:14	91	21:5-6	10, 12
13:25	233, 234	17:15	90	21:5	366
13:26	19	17:20-18:8	256, 329, 339, 347	21:7	11
13:28f	232	17:20-37	347-353	21:8-9	253
13:28	312	17:20f	426	21:10-11	10, 16, 256
13:29	234	17:21	29, 233	21:12-15	10, 17, 18, 22, 256
13:30	343	17:22	396		
13:31-35	330	17:23	29		
		17:24	396		

21:13	19	23:1	333	1:19	139
21:14f	21	23:2	68, 295	1:21	445
21:16-17	18, 22, 253	23:3	252	1:25	445
21:18-19	10, 17, 18,	23:4-25	256	1:51	210, 387
	21, 22, 256	23:4	333	2	90
21:18	22	23:5	331	2:6	92
21:20-24	45, 244, 256	23:8	288	2:11	212
21:20	10, 26	23:11	332	2:13-22	83, 86, 102,
21:21-22	10, 253	23:13	332		206-209
21:23-24	10, 253	23:14	332	2:17	86
21:25-28	10, 256, 368	23:26	252	2:18ff	83
21:27	253, 396	23:27-34	256	2:19	66, 67, 71, 72,
21:34-36	58, 59	23:27-31	364-365		73, 401
21:35	59	23:27	332	2:21f	71
21:36	396	23:28-31	244	3:5	211, 233
21:37-38	256, 366	23:29	360	3:13f	388
21:37	102	23:34	252, 294, 331	3:19	480
21:38	331	23:35-37	256	3:23	139
22:1-13	252	23:35	295, 332	3:25	92, 139
22:14	253	23:36	332	4:4-42	317
22:14-18	256	23:39-43	256	4:10	211
22:16	233	23:39	295, 332	4:14	210
22:19	252	23:44-45	252	4:19	278
22:20	252	23:46-49	256	4:20	130
22:21-38	42	23:47	266, 294	4:21-23	210
22:21-23	249, 252	23:48	332	4:35-38	37
22:22	396	23:50-54	252	5:2ff	99
22:24-33	256	23:55-56	256	5:14	102
22:24-28	252	24:1-49	256	5:17	411
22:25-27	402	24:4	288	5:27	388
22:27	324	24:7	396, 400	6:14f	278
22:28-30	406	24:10	332	6:27	388, 405
22:29	231, 241	24:13-35	291-293	6:53	388
22:30	233, 238, 407,	24:19	280, 285, 332	6:62	388
	417	24:20f	266	6:69	266, 294
22:31-34	223	24:21	263, 297, 336	7:28	102
22:33	333	24:26	233, 296, 297	7:37-39	211, 213, 214
22:34	252	24:27	43, 445	8:2	102
22:35-51	256	24:32	43	8:12ff	100
22:37	330	24:36-49	293	8:20	102
22:47-53	249, 252	24:44-47	43	8:28	388
22:47	333	24:45f	266	8:58	14
22:48	396	24:45	43	8:59	102
22:52-53	252, 256	24:46-49	300	9:1ff	99
22:52	332	24:46	296, 400	10:7	235
22:54-62	252	24:47	43	10:9	235
22:54	256, 332	24:49	46, 254	10:22-39	212
22:63-71	256	24:50-53	97, 247	10:23	102, 367
22:64	285	24:53	100, 366	10:36	212
22:66	68, 332			10:38	212
22:67	295	<i>John</i>		10:47ff	442
22:69	296, 390, 396	1:12	406	11:48	208
23:1-2	256	1:14	209	12:1-8	315

12:13	357	2:24	15	4:27	266, 281, 294,
12:15	474	2:25ff	282		295, 330
12:23	337, 388	2:29	299	4:30	266, 281, 294
12:31	480	2:31	296	4:31	97, 445
12:34	388	2:33	280, 300, 445	4:32	445
12:41	212	2:36	272, 296, 299, 330	4:33	303
13	324	2:38	88, 280, 302,	5:1-11	226
13:10	92, 143		330	5:9	37
13:16	402	2:39	191, 300	5:12	94, 99, 100, 367
13:31	388	2:40	305, 322	5:13	303
14-17	42, 60	2:41-47	97	5:14	303
14:2	231, 233	2:41	303	5:17	303
14:19	415	2:46	100, 318, 366	5:20	100, 366
14:23	212	2:47	303	5:25	366
15:3	92, 143	2:49	272	5:28	100, 330, 367
15:19f	21	3:1	98	5:29ff	100
16:12f	43	3:2	99	5:29	323
16:16	415	3:6	280	5:31	266, 268, 272
16:21	59	3:11	99, 366, 367		282, 294, 297, 303
17:5	212	3:12-26	100, 264,	5:32	280
17:22	406		266-268, 278-280,	5:34	304, 315
17:23	212		302	5:36f	304
17:26	212	3:12	299	5:36	277
18:20	102	3:13-15	330	5:38f	304
19:34	211	3:13	294, 400	5:42	99, 100, 318, 366
20:22f	78	3:14	294	6:1-7:58	256
20:22	43, 46, 211	3:15	282, 294	6	319
20:23	226, 405	3:17	299, 323, 331	6:2	268
21:23	195, 458	3:18	296, 330	6:5	268
<i>Acts</i>		3:19-21	276, 346	6:6	97
1-15	299, 310	3:19	349	6:9	305
1-5	305	3:20f	269	6:10	21
1:1-5	247, 467	3:20	296	6:12	304
1:2	42, 46	3:21	263	6:13f	69
1:1-12	46, 256	3:22	293	6:14	66, 67, 71, 72,
1:6	254, 292, 301, 336	3:25	312, 329		154, 155, 156, 366
1:7	39	3:26	294	7	154, 156-160,
1:8	301	4:1	303, 366		280-281
1:9	387	4:4	303	7:1	304
1:10	288	4:5f	303	7:2	300
1:11	387	4:7	366	7:5f	302
1:12-5:42	256	4:8-10	100, 299	7:10	21
1:14	97	4:9-12	216	7:17	312, 329
1:24	97	4:10	280, 330	7:22	291
2-3	306	4:11	214, 217, 400	7:23ff	294, 336
2:5	302	4:12	272, 297	7:23	466
2:6	366	4:19f	323	7:25f	336
2:14-40	100, 301-302	4:21	303	7:25	297
2:14	299	4:24-30	97	7:30	466
2:20	31, 303	4:24	273	7:32	266
2:22	279, 291, 299	4:25f	281, 283	7:35	284, 292, 294,
2:23	330	4:25	263		297, 336
		4:26	333	7:36	466

7:37	293	13:27f	330	4:3	53
7:47ff	128	13:29	330	4:9	53
7:48	69	13:33f	296	4:25	400
7:51f	305	13:33	282, 283	8:3	90
7:51	280, 300	13:38	300	8:18	406
7:52	266, 294, 330, 450	13:47	274, 431	8:29	410
7:55	390	14:22	21, 55, 56, 60,	8:32	400
7:56	371, 390, 391, 453		233	9:11	298
7:58—8:4	305	15:1-22	256	9	430
7:59-60	256	15:1-11	306	9:3	431
8:2	256	15:5	328	9:6f	343
8:5-40	256	15:10	321	9:9	53
8:5-25	305, 317	15:11	310	9:15	53
8:26-40	305	15:12	268	9:32f	214, 218
9:15f	431	15:13-21	308-310	9:33	189, 221
9:15	431	15:14	263, 338	10:5	53
9:27	155	15:16-18	200-205	10:11	53
9:31	188	15:16f	431	10:12	337
9:32—11:18	256	15:16	160	10:13	53
10:1—11:18 78, 93, 143,	305	15:30-33	256	10:16	53, 298
	314	15:30	268	10:21	298
10:2	314	15:32	445	11:13	431
10:22	314	15:33	254, 338	11:14f	432
10:27	318	16:14	147	11:15	429
10:28	314	17:2f	266	11:25f	347, 361, 431
10:34-43	306-307, 337	17:24	69, 155	11:34	53
10:36	308	19:1-7	445	12:1	190
10:38	295	20:17ff	42	12:6f	445
10:39	330	20:31	59	12:19	53
10:40	400	20:32	188	13:9	53
10:42	43	21:9	445	13:11-14	57
10:43	280	21:10f	445	14	93
10:45	306	21:26ff	87, 97	14:11	53
11:2	306	21:28	69, 144, 187	15:4	56, 447
11:3	78, 318, 328	21:31ff	85	15:8f	429
11:17	306	21:38	278	15:20	184, 188, 215
11:18	306	22-28	247	15:21	337
11:19-24	156, 256	22:7	360	15:25ff	432
11:20	155	22:21	431	16:25-27	28
11:24	254, 307	23:12f	144		
11:27-30	256	23:24	18	1 Corinthians	
11:27f	445	24:5f	144	1:19	53
11:27	445	24:5	159	2:6-9	402
12:1-19	333	24:26,	330	2:8	213, 331
12:12	318	24:44	330	2:16	53
13:1	445	24:46	330	3:5-17	188-185
13:16-41	254, 256, 307-308	26:17f	431	3:9	188
		26:22f	266	3:10f	176, 227
13:16	300, 302	27:34	22	3:10	215
13:23	272, 279, 282, 300			3:11	196, 214
13:24	294	Romans		3:16f	179, 191, 204
13:26	272, 298, 300, 312, 329	1:5	431	3:17	447
		1:17f	339	3:19	53

4:8	406	2:15f	339	4:15f	188, 222
5:1-5	226	3:7-4:6	213	4:16	188
5:6	179	4:14	185	4:29	188
6:2	179, 325, 406	5:1	185-186, 204	5:1f	190
6:3	179	5:5	186	5:5	233
6:4	406	5:10	185	5:26	143
6:9f	179, 233	6:2	53, 431	6:10-18	57
6:15	179	6:14-7:1	177-179, 194, 204, 213, 242	<i>Philippians</i>	
6:16f	179	6:16	181	2:5-11	386
6:18-20	179-181	8:21	53	2:16	431
6:19f	204	9:7	53	3:6	305
7:25	448	10:8	188	4:18	190
7:33	275	11:26	85	<i>Colossians</i>	
8:1	188	12:2	479	1:9	28
8:10	188	12:19	188	1:19	205
9:9	53	13:10	188	1:23	188
9:13	179	<i>Galatians</i>		1:24	431
9:24	179	1:6ff	183	2:2	28
10:1ff	311	1:13	305	2:7	182, 188
10:2	288	1:15	431	2:9	205
10:4	213, 214	1:16	43, 431	<i>1 Thessalonians</i>	
10:23	188	1:18	298	1:1	455
10:26	53	2:1-10	298	1:10	456
11:23	400	2:7	298	2:12	55
11:24f	418	2:9	12, 183, 194-195, 197, 205, 214	2:14-16	430, 456-457
12:3	21	2:12	78	2:15	450
12:28f	446	2:14	306	3:13	34
13:2	84	2:15	314	4:13f	53
14	445	2:18	188	4:15	407
14:2	188	4:26	187, 195	4:16-17	53, 54, 62, 407-408, 448
14:3	55, 188	5:14	53	4:16	392
14:5	188, 437	5:21	233	4:18	53
14:12	188	<i>Ephesians</i>		5:1-11	57, 358, 446
14:17	188	1:8	21, 28	5:2	325
14:21	53	1:17	213	5:3	59
14:26	188	2	217	5:4	59, 325
14:38	447	2:11ff	190, 191, 192	5:6	59
15	185, 293	2:13	302	5:10	59
15:3-7	62, 300	2:14ff	337	5:11	188
15:3f	207	2:17	302	5:19-21	445
15:3	266, 296	2:19-22	190-194, 205, 222, 223	<i>2 Thessalonians</i>	
15:4	400	2:20	197, 214, 225, 445	1:1	445
15:9	305	3:4	28	1:4-10	451
15:27	53	3:5	445, 446	1:4-6	450
15:44	186	3:17	182, 188	2	53, 57, 430, 479
15:45	53	4:7ff	21	2:2	60
15:50	233	4:11	445, 446	2:4	27, 187
15:51	54	4:12	188	2:9	29
15:52	414				
16:22	447				
<i>2 Corinthians</i>					
1:5	60				

<i>1 Timothy</i>		2:4f	74, 400	1:18	226
3:15	170, 197, 204	2:5	192	2:3	448
3:16	386	2:6	193, 219, 220, 221, 223	2:26f	406
<i>2 Timothy</i>		2:7	400	3:3	59
2:12	406	2:8	218	3:7	226
2:19	197, 204, 214	2:9	238	3:8	234
<i>Titus</i>		4:7	58	3:12	197
2:14	143	4:13f	450	3:20	37
<i>Hebrews</i>		4:13	60	3:21	325, 407
1:5-14	386	4:17	126, 198, 204	4:5	386
2:10	266	5:8	58, 59	5:9f	406
3:4	467	5:12	445	6	15, 16
3:1-6	198, 205	<i>2 Peter</i>		6:10	451
6:2	143	3:3ff	458	7:15	209
9:11	69, 160	3:10	59, 325	11	126
9:14	143	<i>1 John</i>		11:1f	196
9:24	69, 160	1:7	143	11:8	288
10:19ff	481	2:18	479	11:12	387
10:23ff	22	2:22	479	11:18	184
10:32-36	450	3:13	21	12	49
11:10	198	4:1-3	479	12:3-5	15
12:2	266, 410	5:6-8	211	13:18	28
12:18-24	198	<i>2 John</i>		14:14	387
13:15	190	7	479	14:15	36
13:22	55	<i>3 John</i>		16:15	59
<i>James</i>		10	445	17:9-12	462
2:5	233	<i>Revelation</i>		17:9	28
5:7-9	58	1-3	54	17:15	362
5:9	37	1:1-3	445	18:20	446
<i>1 Peter</i>		1:1	43	19:9	238
1:6	450	1:7	346, 387	20:4	407
1:7	34	1:12-18	385	21:2	107
1:10f	56, 447	1:12f	43	21:3	178, 196, 204, 209
1:11	406	1:13	387	21:7	178
2	194			21:10f	196, 197
2:4-9	188-190, 198, 205, 214, 219-222			21:14	193, 196, 204, 214, 225
				21:22	107, 196
				22:1f	171
				22:1	211
				22:18f	447

5. EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

<i>Didache</i>		16:2-3	22	<i>2 Clement</i>	
4:14	95	16:6	484	9:3	181
8:1	79	16:7	34	<i>Barnabas</i>	
8:2	33			6:2-4	222
9-10	281	<i>1 Clement</i>		4:5f	28
10:5	33	5:2ff	22, 194	4:11	181
12:3	445	6:1	21	6:15	181
16	48	48:3	234	16:2	145
16:1f	53				

16:4	145	Origen	<i>Haereses</i>	
16:6	145		XI	133
16:10	145	<i>Contra Celsum</i>	XVIII	133
19:12	95	I, 57	XIX, 3	141
		V, 38	XXIX, 4	239
Ignatius			XXX, 13	141
		Hippolytus	XXX, 17	141
<i>Ephesians</i>			LXXVIII, 14	239
9:1	199, 205	<i>Refutatio</i>		
15:3	181	V, 8, 20	Lactantius	
		IX, 13, 4	<i>Div. Inst.</i>	
<i>Philippians</i>		IX, 15, 4-6	IV, 21	45
7:2	181		Jerome	
9:1	234	Tertullian		
Hermas		<i>Apologeticum</i>		
		21	<i>Comm. on Dn.</i>	
<i>Visions</i>		38	9:24	463
3	199	<i>De resurrectione carnis</i>	Augustine	
		22		
<i>Similitudes</i>			<i>De sermone domini in monte</i>	
9	199, 205	<i>Adversus Praxean</i>	I, 26	95
9, 12, 1	234	26		
9, 14, 6	199, 215		<i>Apostolic Constitutions</i>	
9, 15, 4	199	<i>De anima</i>	VII, 31f	47
Justin		33	VIII, 32	142
		Cyprian	<i>Pseudo-Clementines</i>	
<i>1 Apology</i>			<i>Homilies</i>	
26:3	317	<i>Quod idola</i>	2:23	139
50	42	14	3:52	234
51	34		8:2	141
67	42	<i>Testimonia</i>	9:23	141
		I, 6	10:1	141
<i>Dialogue</i>		II, 26	10:26	141
53	42		11:1	141
80	134, 155	Eusebius	11:30	141
106	42			
113	277	<i>Historia eccl.</i>		
117:2	131	II, 1, 4	<i>Recognitions</i>	
		II, 23, 6	1:19	141
Irenaeus		II, 23, 7	1:37	140
		II, 23, 8	1:39	140
<i>Adversus Haereses</i>		II, 23, 12f	1:41	480
I, 25, 5	46	II, 23, 13	1:48	140
V, 28, 6	39	III, 31, 3	1:54	260
		IV, 22, 5	1:55	140
Clement Alex.		IV, 22, 7	1:60	260
		V, 24, 3	1:64	486
<i>Stromata</i>		V, 24, 12	2:71	141
VI, 5, 43	430		4:3	141
VI, 15, 128	447	Epiphanius	6:1	141

6:11	141	<i>Gospel of Thomas</i>		<i>Testamentum Domini</i>	
		Log. 1	45	<i>Nostri Jesu Christi</i>	44, 46
<i>Gospel of Peter</i>		22	231		
VII, 26	69, 144	66	216		
X, 39-42	484	71	152	<i>Odes of Solomon</i>	
				42:6	448
<i>Apocalypse of Peter</i>		<i>Gospel of Ebionites</i>			
1-2	44			<i>Pap. Oxyr. 840</i>	145
1	484		140, 141		

6. HELLENISTIC LITERATURE

Josephus		V, 491ff	360	XVII, 345ff	443
		VI, 94ff	460	XVIII, 19	121
<i>Jewish War (B.J.)</i>		VI, 108	117	XVIII, 55-89	27, 341
I, 78ff	441	VI, 109f	461	XVIII, 60-62	342
I, 78	100	VI, 124f	87	XVIII, 85-87	134,
I, 650-653	353	VI, 126f	361	278, 342	
II, i-vi	354	VI, 138	117	XVIII, 85	150
II, 13	342	VI, 201ff	358	XVIII, 242ff	25
II, 80	354	VI, 249ff	462	XX, 97	29, 277, 467
II, 112f	442	VI, 250	117	XX, 168	278
II, 129	137	VI, 252	117	XX, 169f	276, 467
II, 159	444	VI, 267	117	XX, 188	278
II, 160f	123	VI, 285f	462		
II, 175-177	242	VI, 285	29	<i>Life</i>	
II, 184ff	25	VI, 288-300	359	II	134
II, 187	14	VI, 289	485	17-19	424
II, 203	26	VI, 294	465		
II, 259	278	VI, 299f	345	<i>Contra Apionem</i>	
II, 261ff	467	VI, 300f	424	I, 38ff	443
II, 261	278	VI, 301	117, 442	II, 106	85
II, 262	361	VI, 303ff	68		
II, 411	88	VI, 311-313	458	Philo	
II, 430	117	VI, 311	461		
II, 539	117	VI, 316	462	<i>De vita cont.</i>	
III, 352	440	VII, 218	101	21	133
III, 402	459	VII, 438	278	37	133
IV, 151	85			66	133
IV, 163ff	460	<i>Antiquities</i>		73f	133
IV, 171	361	X, 267	461	81	133
IV, 204	87	X, 276	460	85ff	133
IV, 313	87	XII, 1	443		
IV, 318	460	XII, 311ff	443	<i>Prob.</i>	
IV, 323	117	XIII, 62-73	11 ^d	75	122
IV, 335	322	XV, 373ff	443		
IV, 388	460	XV, 373	441	<i>Legat. ad Gaium</i>	
V, 187	87	XV, 391	112	29-43	25
V, 193f	191	XVII, 43ff	443		
V, 194	87	XVII, 151-155	35	Pliny	
V, 195	87	XVII, 216f	342		
V, 262ff	360	XVII, viii-xiii	354	<i>Epistolae</i>	
V, 412	117	XVII, 300	354	X, 96	103

Tacitus		<i>Historiae</i>		Suetonius	
<i>Annales</i>		V, 9	25	<i>Vespasian</i>	
XV, 44	21	V, 13	345, 459, 465	VI, 5	495

7. RABBINIC LITERATURE

<i>Talmudim</i>		A.Z. 8b	466	<i>Numbers Rabbah</i>	
		A.Z. 16b-17a	146	15:10	109
<i>Mishnah</i>		<i>Jerusalem Talmud</i>		<i>Lamentations Rabbah</i>	
Ber 9:5	85, 99, 239	Ber 5a	150, 463	1:5	151, 460
Bik 3:4	87	Shab 15d	442	1:16	150, 463
Shab 6:8	99	Taan 65b	387	1:31	460
Pes 5:5ff	87	Sanh 18a	466	<i>Pesikta Rabbati</i>	
Shek 7:2f	87	Sanh 24b	466	1 (40)	465
Yoma 3:3	132	<i>Tosephta</i>		<i>Tanhuma</i>	
Yoma 8:9	95	Taan 4:10	149	Ekeb 7b	465
Suk 10:9f	211	Sanh 13:5	144	<i>Midrash Tehillim</i>	
Sotah 9:12	443	Yad 2:20	134	Ps 2:9	375
Sotah 9:15	454	<i>Aboth de Rabbi Nathan</i>		<i>Seder Eliahu Rabba</i>	
Sanh 11:2	87	4	3, 151, 459	14 (65)	365
Sheb 9:1	321	25	194	<i>Yalkut</i>	
Aboth 3:3	132	<i>Seder Olam Rabbah</i>		1, 766	225
Aboth 3:6	96	28	463	<i>Targumim</i>	
Men 10:9	80	<i>Midrashim</i>		Gen 44:16	328
Mid 1:3	99	<i>Siphre</i>		Ps 78:13	321
Kel 17:9	99	Dt 1:7	119	Is 2:13	151
Neg 3:1	99	<i>Genesis Rabbah</i>		Is 6:5	212
Par 3:6	99	69:3	210	Is 10:34	151
<i>Babylonian Talmud</i>		100:10	466	Is 16:5	272
Ber 22a	134	<i>Exodus Rabbah</i>		Is 28:16	172
Ber 55a	132	2:6	195	Is 53:5	149, 400
Yoma 9a	109	15:8	225	Amos 9:11f	167
Yoma 39b	151, 465, 481	<i>Leviticus Rabbah</i>		Zech 6:12f	149
Meg 3a	461	9:6	148	Zech 11:1	151
Meg 12a	148	34	321	<i>Tephillah</i>	
Hag 14a	375, 407			Benedic. 14	111, 149
Git 56a	466			15	263
Git 56b	459			17	111
B. Bath 12a	443				
Sanh 41a	466				
Sanh 97a	21				
Sanh 97b	464				
Sanh 98a	334				
Sanh 99a	465				

8. MANDAEAN LITERATURE

<i>Book of John</i>		<i>Right Ginza</i>	
76	73, 153	331ff	153